

EXHIBIT 7

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

June 16, 2009



Phone: 206 287 9066
Fax: 206 287 9832
Email: info@buellrealtime.com
Internet: www.buellrealtime.com

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re:) Chapter 11
)
W.R. GRACE & CO., et al.,) No. 01-01139 (JKF)
)
Debtors.)

Videotaped Deposition Upon Oral Examination Of
ALAN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.D.

Taken at 17620 International Boulevard
Seattle, Washington

DATE TAKEN: June 16, 2009

REPORTED BY: CATHY ZAK, CCR# 1922

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 For LIBBY CLAIMANTS:</p> <p>4 TOM L. LEWIS</p> <p>5 LEWIS, SLOVAK & KOVACICH</p> <p>6 P.O. Box 2325</p> <p>7 Great Falls, Montana 59403</p> <p>8 406.761.5595</p> <p>9 For W.R. GRACE:</p> <p>10 DAVID M. BERNICK</p> <p>11 BRIAN STANSBURY</p> <p>12 HEATHER A. BLOOM</p> <p>13 KIRKLAND & ELLIS</p> <p>14 655 15th Street NW</p> <p>15 Washington, D.C. 20005</p> <p>16 202.879.5969</p> <p>17 For W.R. GRACE and OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF ASBESTOS</p> <p>18 PERSONAL INJURY CLAIMANT:</p> <p>19 NATHAN D. FINCH</p> <p>20 CAPLIN & DRYSDALE</p> <p>21 One Thomas Circle NW</p> <p>22 Washington, D.C. 20005</p> <p>23 202.862.7801</p> <p>24 For MARYLAND CASUALTY and ZURICH:</p> <p>25 EDWARD J. LONGOSZ</p> <p>ECKERT SEAMANS</p> <p>1747 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, 12th Floor</p> <p>Washington, D.C. 20006</p> <p>202.659.6619</p> <p>For PROPERTY DAMAGE FUTURE CLAIMANTS' REPRESENTATIVE</p> <p>(via telephone):</p> <p>ALAN B. RICH</p> <p>Attorney at Law</p> <p>1401 Elm Street, Suite 4620</p> <p>Dallas, Texas 75202</p> <p>214.744.5100</p>	<p>1 DEPOSITION OF ALAN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.D.</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 EXAMINATION INDEX</p> <p>4 EXAMINATION BY PAGE</p> <p>5 Mr. Finch 8</p> <p>6 Mr. Bernick 106</p> <p>7 Mr. Svirskey 323</p> <p>8 Ms. DeCristofaro 351</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 EXHIBIT INDEX</p> <p>11 EXHIBITS FOR IDENTIFICATION PAGE</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 1 Sur-Rebuttal and Supplemental 9</p> <p>14 Expert Report</p> <p>15 Exhibit-4 to Exhibit Book 12</p> <p>16 Trust Distrubution Procedures</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 3 Final Key Libby Patients 13</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 4 CARD Document 18</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 5 Diagnosis and Initial 50</p> <p>23 Management of Nonmalignant</p> <p>24 Disease Related to Asbestos</p> <p>25</p> <p>6 Document 79</p> <p>7 Memorandum 87</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 Changes in the Normal Maximal 102</p> <p>Expiratory Flow-Volume Curve</p> <p>with Growth and Aging</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 9 Radiographic (ILO) Readings 102</p> <p>12 Predict Arterial Oxygen</p> <p>13 Desaturation During Exercise</p> <p>14 in Subjects with Asbestosis</p> <p>15</p>
Page 3	Page 5
<p>1 APPEARANCES (continuing)</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 For STATE OF MONTANA (via telephone):</p> <p>4 SAMANTHA P. TRAVIS</p> <p>5 CHRISTENSEN, MOORE, COCKRELL, CUMMINGS &</p> <p>6 AXELBERG</p> <p>7 145 Commons Loop; Suite 200</p> <p>8 P.O. Box 7370</p> <p>9 Kalispell, Montana 59904</p> <p>10 406.751.6010</p> <p>11 For ARROWOOD INDEMNITY COMPANY (via telephone):</p> <p>12 BRAD M. ELIAS</p> <p>13 GARY SVIRSKY</p> <p>14 O'MELVENY & MYERS</p> <p>15 7 Times Square</p> <p>16 New York, New York 10036</p> <p>17 212.326.2248</p> <p>18 For CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY and CONTINENTAL</p> <p>19 INSURANCE COMPANY (via telephone)</p> <p>20 ELIZABETH M. DeCRISTOFARO</p> <p>21 FORD MARRIN ESPOSITO WITMEYER & GLESER</p> <p>22 Wall Street Plaza, 23rd Floor</p> <p>23 New York, New York 10005</p> <p>24 212.269.4900</p> <p>25 For ALLSTATE (via telephone):</p> <p>ANDREW K. CRAIG</p> <p>CUYLER BURK</p> <p>4 Century Drive</p> <p>Parsippany, New Jersey 07054</p> <p>973.734.3225</p> <p>Also Present:</p> <p>CECIL GRANT - Videographer</p> <p>JEANNA RICKARDS</p> <p>* * * * *</p>	<p>1 EXHIBIT INDEX (continuing)</p> <p>2 EXHIBITS FOR IDENTIFICATION PAGE</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 10 Guides to the Evaluation of 102</p> <p>5 Permanent Impairment</p> <p>6 11 Journal of Occupational 102</p> <p>7 Medicine and Toxicology</p> <p>8</p> <p>9 12 Lung Function Testing: 102</p> <p>10 Selection of Reference Values</p> <p>11 and Interpretative Strategies</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 13 Asbestos-Induced Pleural 102</p> <p>14 Fibrosis and Impaired Lung</p> <p>15 Function</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 14 The Effect of Asbestos- 102</p> <p>18 Induced Pleural Fibrosis on</p> <p>19 Pulmonary Function:</p> <p>20 Quantitative Evaluation</p> <p>21 15 CARD Mortality Study 227</p> <p>22 16 CARD Mortality Study 253</p> <p>23</p> <p>24 ***** (* Denotes phonetic spelling.)</p> <p>25</p>

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

Buell Realtime Reporting
206 287 9066

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Tuesday, 2 June 16, 2009, at 17620 International Boulevard, 3 Seattle, Washington, at 8:33 a.m., before CATHY M. 4 ZAK, CCR, Notary Public in and for the State of 5 Washington, appeared ALAN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.D., the 6 witness herein; 7 WHEREUPON, the following proceedings 8 were had, to wit: 9 10 <<<<<< >>>>>> 11 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. We're 13 now on the record. Today is June 16th, 2009, and the 14 time is now 8:33 a.m. The location of today's 15 deposition is 17620 International Boulevard, SeaTac, 16 Washington 98188. 17 My name is Cecil Grant, video specialist 18 representing Buell Realtime Reporting out of Seattle, 19 Washington, for this cause number 01-1139 JKF in re 20 W.R. Grace & Company, et al. 21 Today's deponent is Dr. Alan C. Whitehouse. 22 Would counsel please identify themselves and 23 state whom you represent? 24 MR. FINCH: My name is Nathan Finch. I 25 represent W.R. Grace and Official Committee of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. Could you 2 repeat the name again? I can't hear you. 3 MS. DeCRISTOFARO: Sure. It's 4 Elizabeth DeCristofaro. That's 5 D-E-C-R-I-S-T-O-F-A-R-O. 6 MR. RICH: Alan Rich for the Property 7 Damage Future Claimants' Representative. 8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Is that everyone on 9 the phone? 10 MR. CRAIG: Hi. Andrew Craig, 11 C-R-A-I-G, for Allstate Insurance. 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The court reporter 13 today is Cathy Zak with Buell Realtime Reporting. 14 Please swear in the witness and proceed with 15 the deposition. 16 17 ALAN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.D., having been first duly 18 sworn by the Notary, 19 deposed and testified as 20 follows: 21 22 23 EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. FINCH: 25 Q Dr. Whitehouse, as you heard before, my name</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 Asbestos Personal Injury Claimants. With me is my 2 colleague Jeanna Rickards. 3 MR. LONGOSZ: My name Edward Longosz 4 and I represent Maryland Casualty and Zurich. 5 MR. STANSBURY: Brian Stansbury, 6 Kirkland & Ellis, and I represent W.R. Grace & 7 Company. 8 MR. LEWIS: Tom Lewis. I represent the 9 Libby claimants. 10 MS. BLOOM: Heather Bloom with 11 Kirkland & Ellis and I represent W.R. Grace. 12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel on the 13 phone. 14 MR. FINCH: Hello? Is there any 15 counsel on the telephone. 16 MR. ELIAS: Hello. This is Brad Elias 17 from O'Melveny & Myers. We represent Arrowood 18 Indemnity Company. I'm here with my colleague Gary 19 Svirsky. 20 MS. TRAVIS: Hello. This is Samantha 21 Travis representing the State of Montana. 22 MS. DeCRISTOFARO: Hello. This is 23 Elizabeth DeCristofaro of Ford Marrin representing 24 Continental Casualty Company and Continental 25 Insurance Company.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 is Nate Finch and I represent the Grace ACC or 2 Official Committee of Asbestos Personal Injury 3 Claimants. 4 Are you taking any medications that would 5 preclude your ability to understand questions or 6 remember things? 7 A No. 8 Q Is there any reason as you sit here today you 9 can think of why you wouldn't be able to understand 10 and remember things as well today as you normally do? 11 A No. I do wear hearing aids and people need 12 to talk up. 13 Q Okay. I'll do that. If you don't understand 14 one of my questions, can you please let me know and 15 I'll attempt to rephrase it and make it more clear? 16 A I will. 17 MR. FINCH: Madam Court Reporter, can 18 we mark this as Whitehouse Exhibit-1? 19 (Exhibit-1 marked for 20 identification.) 21 Q (By Mr. Finch) Dr. Whitehouse, do you have 22 Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-1 in front of you? 23 A I do. 24 Q Could you just verify that this is your May 25 2009 expert witness report in the Grace bankruptcy</p>

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

Buell Realtime Reporting
206 287 9066

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 case with the attachments except that I haven't 2 included all of the CD ROMs? I've just not included 3 those, but the rest of the attachments I believe we 4 have collected and -- 5 A It would appear that way. 6 Q Okay. Now, you have submitted in addition to 7 this May 2009 report a report in December of 2008 and 8 another report in March of 2009; is that correct? 9 A I believe so. 10 Q Is the May 2009 report that is Whitehouse 11 Deposition Exhibit-1 -- as I read this, it looks like 12 it appears to supplement and update and replace the 13 March report and the December report? 14 A Yeah, basically it does. It just updates 15 what's been done before. 16 Q Okay. So this report, Whitehouse Exhibit-1, 17 the May 2009 report contains -- leaving aside your 18 rebuttals to the other medical experts, but this 19 contains your opinions and conclusions you've been 20 asked to testify about in the Grace case? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Do you understand what the purpose of an 23 expert witness report is? 24 A Yes. 25 Q And what's your understanding of what the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 mesothelioma medical exposure criteria; is that 2 correct? 3 A Show me that paragraph again before I answer 4 that question to be sure. Where's it located again? 5 Q Well, you talk about mesothelioma. 6 A Yeah, I don't think so, but I want to make 7 sure. 8 Q You want to see the paragraph from the TDP? 9 A No, the paragraph in here relative to it. 10 Q Well, you talk about -- 11 A And the paragraph in the TDP too. 12 MR. FINCH: Why don't we mark the TDP 13 as Deposition Exhibit-2. 14 (Exhibit-2 marked for 15 identification.) 16 Q (By Mr. Finch) And the reason, 17 Dr. Whitehouse, I don't want to refer you to your 18 reports is because I've read through all your reports 19 and I didn't see anything in there that criticized 20 the mesothelioma medical exposure criteria and the 21 TDP. 22 A I don't know there is actually, but I want 23 to -- I want to be sure. 24 (Mr. Bernick enters.) 25 Q (By Mr. Finch) Okay. Page 24 of the TDP.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 purpose of that expert witness report is? 2 A I guess the best way to put it is to put up 3 front the opinions relative to the situation at hand. 4 Q To put forth the opinions you're going to 5 give and the basis for those opinions; is that fair? 6 A That's correct. 7 Q Okay. I've read -- and you understand that 8 this is a bankruptcy case where the Court is going to 9 be asked to either approve or disapprove a plan of 10 reorganization. Do you have that understanding? 11 A That's true. 12 Q And as I understand it, you have reviewed the 13 medical and exposure criteria in what's called the 14 Grace Trust Distribution Procedures, TDP? 15 A I have. 16 Q And you have some opinions about the Grace 17 TDP? Can I call it the Grace TDP? 18 A I do. 19 Q Do you have opinions about the medical and -- 20 well, you have some opinions about the Grace TDP that 21 you have described at various places in your reports, 22 correct? 23 A Correct. 24 Q I've read through all of your reports in this 25 case and I didn't see any criticism of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 A No, I don't have any problems with it. 2 Q When you came in the room today, your counsel 3 handed out this document. 4 MR. FINCH: Let's make this Whitehouse 5 Exhibit-3. 6 (Exhibit-3 marked for 7 identification.) 8 MR. LEWIS: Actually, Dr. Whitehouse -- 9 A I have a copy of it already, so... (Pause.) 10 MR. BERNICK: Well, is there -- 11 A I didn't bring this one with me. 12 Q (By Mr. Finch) Okay. 13 MR. LEWIS: And it was prepared by my 14 co-counsel, Jon Heberling and his firm, so I don't 15 want to mislead anybody on that. 16 Q (By Mr. Finch) Dr. Whitehouse, what is 17 Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-3? 18 A What is what? 19 Q What is Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-3? 20 What is this document? 21 A Oh, basically, I don't understand all the 22 machinations that went into this except that in order 23 to maintain confidentiality of patients that are not 24 clients of these two attorneys and to not violate 25 HIPAA rules, they were identified by number and by</p>

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 initials in here and this is basically the numbering 2 of all their clients, plus all the other people that 3 are involved in studies and things like that that are 4 presented here like that paper and the mortality 5 study. 6 So it totals about 1,030 numbers, of which a 7 good number of are initials because they're 8 confidential. 9 Q Okay. And on the first page of this separate 10 cover page, there's a column that says Libby 11 Claimant -- 12 A Yes. 13 Q -- do you see that? 14 So if it says yes, that means there's 15 somebody that sued or would otherwise sue W.R. Grace 16 there because they filed a lawsuit? 17 A That's correct and then if you'll notice, the 18 ones that say Libby Claimant, no, they're usually -- 19 there should be initials by those. 20 Q Okay. And those -- 21 A I actually haven't seen this much myself, but 22 that's what I understand. 23 Q Okay. The people that are nos are people who 24 were not the clients of either Mr. Heberling's law 25 firm or Mr. Lewis' law firm, right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 Libby with various forms of asbestos disease due to 2 what we call Libby asbestos, but I also in my 3 practice have been involved in seeing a large number 4 of people with predominantly chrysotile disease, 5 basically commercial chrysotile disease from Hanford 6 and Wallula Paper Mill and a beet factory in Moses 7 Lake and the shipyards in western Washington, a lot 8 of them sent to me by State of Washington for 9 evaluation of their disease, and then a lot of them 10 that I followed over a period of years. 11 Q What do you mean in your report and opinions 12 by Libby asbestos? 13 A Well, basically what's happened is that when 14 Libby -- or when the asbestos problems in Libby were 15 originally defined, the fiber itself was 16 characterized not as tremolite, which is what it -- a 17 term that it had been used for for years. It was 18 then defined as winchite, richterite, with some 19 degree of tremolite, and was a different -- different 20 compound and in order to not have a mouthful of 21 words, everybody has been calling it Libby asbestos 22 since that time. 23 Q Okay. So for purposes of your definition, 24 Libby asbestos refers to the mix of winchite, 25 richterite, and tremolite that is a contaminant in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 A Right. 2 Q Okay. And as I read this, it looks like 3 there's 1,030 people listed on this chart; is that 4 right? 5 A I understand that, mm-hm. 6 Q Now, this doesn't -- these are the people 7 that -- this doesn't include all 1,800 patients with 8 asbestos-related disease that have been seen by the 9 CARD Clinic, does it? 10 A No. 11 Q So you haven't -- or people have not produced 12 the medical records for about 800 of the 1,800 13 people; is that correct? 14 A As far as I know. I -- I've really not been 15 privy to all that's gone on with that. 16 Q Okay. Could you turn in your expert report, 17 Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-1, on Page 1? The 18 bottom of Page 1, you write, I am in a position to 19 compare asbestos disease from Libby asbestos to 20 asbestos disease from chrysotile asbestos. 21 Do you see that? 22 A Yes. 23 Q What do you mean by asbestos disease from 24 Libby asbestos? 25 A Well, I've seen a large number of people from</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 the vermiculite or that was mined at Libby Mountain 2 in Montana? 3 A Yeah, basically. 4 Q Okay. Do you have some kind of position with 5 the CARD Clinic? 6 A I'm a pulmonary consultant to the CARD 7 Clinic. I go up there on a fairly regular basis. I 8 have been for a number of years. 9 Q Are you paid a salary at all by the CARD 10 Clinic? 11 A I am. 12 Q What's that salary? 13 A It basically is \$1,000 a day when I'm there. 14 Q And I noticed in your expert report that you 15 say that your hourly rate is \$350 an hour. What do 16 you charge \$350 an hour to do? 17 A Depositions. 18 Q Did you charge for your time in preparing the 19 expert report? 20 A I do. 21 Q Did you charge for your time in either 22 testimony before workers compensation boards or other 23 kind of courtroom testimony in addition to deposition 24 testimony? 25 A I do.</p>

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 Q Approximately how much money have you made</p> <p>2 over the past five years as a result of being asked</p> <p>3 to give expert reports or testimony on matters</p> <p>4 relating to Libby asbestos?</p> <p>5 A Well, there's also the Department of Justice</p> <p>6 that had paid me as well, which you probably know as</p> <p>7 well. I guess probably over \$100,000, but I'm not</p> <p>8 sure I know the exact amount. I've never added it</p> <p>9 up.</p> <p>10 MR. FINCH: Why don't we mark this as</p> <p>11 the next exhibit.</p> <p>12 Q (By Mr. Finch) Are you aware that the CARD</p> <p>13 Clinic maintains a Web site?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 (Exhibit-4 marked for</p> <p>16 identification.)</p> <p>17 Q (By Mr. Finch) Did you have any -- who --</p> <p>18 did you have any role in reviewing the information</p> <p>19 put on the Web site?</p> <p>20 A No, and I have no idea what's on it now.</p> <p>21 Q Would you expect that things that the CARD</p> <p>22 Clinic would say about Libby asbestos disease and</p> <p>23 asbestos disease in general on their Web site to be</p> <p>24 truthful and accurate?</p> <p>25 A Yeah, I can't -- I can't answer that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: Are you representing that</p> <p>2 this is accurate --</p> <p>3 MR. FINCH: Yes.</p> <p>4 MR. LEWIS: -- an accurate</p> <p>5 reproduction?</p> <p>6 MR. FINCH: Yes.</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: Thank you.</p> <p>8 MR. FINCH: It's an accurate</p> <p>9 reproduction of what's on the Web site.</p> <p>10 A I see it.</p> <p>11 Q (By Mr. Finch) All right. Can you go to</p> <p>12 the -- can I see your copy, Dr. Whitehouse, just for</p> <p>13 a second?</p> <p>14 A Sure. (Document passed.)</p> <p>15 Q All right. I've put a tab on the page I want</p> <p>16 you to turn to.</p> <p>17 A Okay.</p> <p>18 MR. LEWIS: Let me see that.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: (Document passed.)</p> <p>20 Q (By Mr. Finch) Do you see that the title of</p> <p>21 that says, Libby Amphibole Asbestos Exposure in</p> <p>22 Libby, Montana?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q The one, two, three, fourth -- fifth</p> <p>25 paragraph down -- and I'm going to read from the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 question. I have not looked at the Web site since</p> <p>2 the first draft, and the thing's came out probably</p> <p>3 over five, six years ago. I haven't even looked at</p> <p>4 it since then.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Would you turn to what's been marked</p> <p>6 as Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-4, and this is</p> <p>7 what -- I'll represent to you this is what I printed</p> <p>8 out from the CARD Clinic Web site a couple of weeks</p> <p>9 ago. There's a section that says, frequently asked</p> <p>10 questions. Do you see that?</p> <p>11 A What page are --</p> <p>12 Q Oh, the front page.</p> <p>13 A Right here?</p> <p>14 Q If you skip past all of the -- and what I</p> <p>15 have done -- because when I printed this out, it cut</p> <p>16 off the columns on the right-hand side. I had my</p> <p>17 secretary go and cut and paste all the words into the</p> <p>18 document behind it so that you can see -- for</p> <p>19 example, if you go about seven pages back, you see</p> <p>20 where the text type changes? All we've done is we've</p> <p>21 taken the text that -- as it appears --</p> <p>22 A Oh, I see what you've done.</p> <p>23 Q -- on the Web page so you can see the whole</p> <p>24 sentence wrap around as opposed to being cut off. Do</p> <p>25 you see that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 typewritten version of this as opposed to the</p> <p>2 printout version because it's -- you can see all the</p> <p>3 words better, but it says, Zonolite and Monocote are</p> <p>4 two trade names under which Libby vermiculite</p> <p>5 products were marketed. There are two overwhelming</p> <p>6 examples of the extent to which exposure can spread</p> <p>7 through commercial products.</p> <p>8 And then it talks about vermiculite --</p> <p>9 Zonolite attic insulation and Monocote spray-on</p> <p>10 fire -- fire proofing. Do you see that?</p> <p>11 A I do.</p> <p>12 Q Did you -- do you have the understanding that</p> <p>13 Libby asbestos was a contaminant in both Monocote</p> <p>14 spray-on fire proofing and Zonolite attic insulation?</p> <p>15 A That's my understanding.</p> <p>16 Q Did you also understand that it was in -- a</p> <p>17 contaminant in many of Grace's other commercial</p> <p>18 construction products as well?</p> <p>19 A Yeah, although I don't know the exact extent</p> <p>20 of them.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. So to the extent that it is -- let me</p> <p>22 back up.</p> <p>23 You're of the view that asbestos Libby (sic)</p> <p>24 from Libby asbestos causes pleural disease that's</p> <p>25 more severe than seen in cohorts of people who were</p>

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 exposed to asbestos that is not Libby asbestos?</p> <p>2 A Both in degree and in amount for a number of</p> <p>3 patient -- people that were exposed to it, yes.</p> <p>4 Q Let me back up.</p> <p>5 What do you mean by degree?</p> <p>6 A It's very hard to quantitate to what degree</p> <p>7 because you can find examples of people with exposure</p> <p>8 that have severe pleural disease, but the frequency</p> <p>9 of people with severe pleural disease and the</p> <p>10 frequency of death from severe pleural disease</p> <p>11 appears to be significantly worse with Libby</p> <p>12 asbestos.</p> <p>13 Q With Libby asbestos.</p> <p>14 Now, mesothelioma is a disease caused by</p> <p>15 exposure to asbestos, right?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Would you agree with me that the prognosis</p> <p>18 for someone who develops mesothelioma as a result of</p> <p>19 being exposed to pure chrysotile asbestos is no</p> <p>20 different than the prognosis for someone who was</p> <p>21 exposed to Libby asbestos?</p> <p>22 A Well, they're all going to die from it.</p> <p>23 Q So would you agree with me that at least for</p> <p>24 mesothelioma, mesothelioma caused by Libby asbestos</p> <p>25 isn't more severe or more fatal than mesothelioma</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 cancer?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And that's the same whether they're</p> <p>4 exposed to Libby asbestos or chrysotile asbestos?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. So to that extent, lung cancer isn't</p> <p>7 any more severe if you get it from being exposed to</p> <p>8 Libby asbestos than if you got exposed to it from</p> <p>9 chrysotile asbestos?</p> <p>10 A Probably not.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. What about gastrointestinal tract</p> <p>12 cancer? There's no difference in severity for those</p> <p>13 kinds of cancers if you were exposed to Libby</p> <p>14 asbestos as opposed to chrysotile asbestos?</p> <p>15 A As far as I know.</p> <p>16 Q Now, most of your opinions focus on pleural</p> <p>17 disease. Have you -- I didn't see anywhere in your</p> <p>18 report where you asserted or indicated that</p> <p>19 asbestosis -- and by asbestosis, I mean interstitial</p> <p>20 fibrosis of the parenchyma of the lung. Do you</p> <p>21 understand that definition of asbestosis?</p> <p>22 A I do.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. I didn't see any assertion that</p> <p>24 asbestosis caused by Libby asbestos, that the</p> <p>25 prognosis for that person is any different than</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 caused by chrysotile asbestos?</p> <p>2 A No, I would agree with that.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Would you also agree with me that the</p> <p>4 prognosis from someone who develops lung cancer as a</p> <p>5 result of exposure to Libby asbestos is no better or</p> <p>6 no worse than the prognosis of someone who develops</p> <p>7 lung cancer as a result of exposure to chrysotile</p> <p>8 asbestos?</p> <p>9 A It's probably not any different, but it may</p> <p>10 depend, on an individual case, on the degree of</p> <p>11 underlying asbestos disease they have.</p> <p>12 Q But generally speaking, if you get lung</p> <p>13 cancer, nine times out of ten you're going to die</p> <p>14 from lung cancer, right?</p> <p>15 A I don't think that that has been our</p> <p>16 experience.</p> <p>17 Q What's been your experience?</p> <p>18 A Well, we do a lot screening for lung cancer</p> <p>19 and we found a significant number of small nodules</p> <p>20 that I'm reasonably certain we have cures from. I</p> <p>21 don't have the data as to what percentage of death</p> <p>22 from lung cancer in Libby we have, but it's, I think,</p> <p>23 less than nine out of ten.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that the</p> <p>25 majority of people who get lung cancer die from lung</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 asbestosis caused by chrysotile asbestos.</p> <p>2 A I think the school is still out on that.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. So you don't -- sitting here today,</p> <p>4 you can't give an opinion that asbestosis caused by</p> <p>5 Libby asbestos is more severe or more likely to lead</p> <p>6 to death than asbestosis caused by chrysotile</p> <p>7 asbestos?</p> <p>8 A I can't make that statement, no.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So really what you're talking about as</p> <p>10 being more severe asbestos disease from Libby</p> <p>11 asbestos as opposed to chrysotile asbestos is pleural</p> <p>12 disease, correct?</p> <p>13 A The pleural disease and the things that are</p> <p>14 associated with pleural disease than Libby which does</p> <p>15 not necessarily exclude interstitial disease or</p> <p>16 subpleural interstitial disease.</p> <p>17 Q Well, would you also agree with me -- let me</p> <p>18 back up, Doctor.</p> <p>19 You know Dr. Art Frank, correct?</p> <p>20 A I do.</p> <p>21 Q Did you read his deposition in preparation</p> <p>22 for your deposition today?</p> <p>23 A I did.</p> <p>24 Q Did you -- did you see where I asked him the</p> <p>25 question of whether there was some kind of magical</p>

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 shield around Lincoln County, Montana, that would 2 make exposure to Libby asbestos in Montana more 3 likely to lead to disease or death as compared to 4 exposure with Libby asbestos in New York City, for 5 example? 6 A I don't have any evidence to, you know, 7 really make any real comment on that because what 8 I've studied has been strictly asbestos in Libby. 9 Q Okay. So you can't say, for example, that 10 people who are exposed to Libby asbestos in Libby are 11 any sicker or have a different severity of their 12 pleural disease as compared to people who are exposed 13 to Libby asbestos in Ohio at a vermiculite processing 14 facility or in New York at a construction site, can 15 you? 16 A No, except that I have seen about a half of a 17 dozen patients over ten years from various expansion 18 plants and other jobs, not only in Spokane, in 19 California, Minnesota who had very severe disease. 20 Q They had very severe disease as a result of 21 being exposed to the Libby asbestos? 22 A Yes. 23 Q And so would you agree with me then that 24 the -- let me back up. 25 Mr. Lewis used a term when he said who he</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 Ph.D. who has tested various Grace commercial 2 construction products and is of the view or actually 3 has confirmed that they, A, contain Libby asbestos -- 4 a lot of them contain asbestos in the vermiculite fix 5 that went in as filler to those products like 6 Monocote. I take it you don't dispute or have any 7 basis to challenge his conclusions about that? 8 MR. LEWIS: Object to the form of the 9 question on the grounds that it's compound. 10 MR. FINCH: Let me rephrase. 11 MR. LEWIS: And it's unintelligible as 12 stated. 13 Q (By Mr. Finch) Did you understand my 14 question? 15 A Yeah, I understand your question, but, you 16 know, I can't recall. That was a long report with, I 17 mean, all kinds of permutations and combinations of 18 times and compounds that he was obviously aware of 19 and I wasn't, so I'm not sure I can really comment on 20 it. 21 Q Okay. So you're just not in a position to 22 comment on it one way -- 23 A No. 24 Q -- or another? 25 And so if he were to come in and testify that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 represented. He said he represents the Libby 2 claimants. And I understood that to mean people who 3 have filed a lawsuit or would have filed a lawsuit 4 against W.R. Grace. Do you have that understanding? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. But you're a doctor and you look at 7 people who -- or a patient with asbestos disease, 8 correct? 9 A That's correct. 10 Q And you treat people regardless of whether 11 they're a claimant or not a claimant? 12 A Yeah. Most of the time when I see them, I 13 don't even know whether they're a claimant or not. 14 Q Okay. And so would you agree with me that to 15 the extent there is something different about the 16 Libby asbestos that causes more severe pleural 17 disease that would affect people who aren't Libby 18 claimants, i.e., people who were exposed to Libby 19 asbestos outside of Libby, Montana, just as it would 20 affect people in Libby, Montana? 21 A I'd make that assumption, yes. 22 Q And have you read William Longo's* report in 23 the Grace case? 24 A It's been quite a while since I read it. 25 Q He is -- he is not a medical doctor. He is a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 Libby asbestos ended up in vermiculite that went into 2 a broad range of Grace's asbestos containing 3 products, you couldn't comment on that one way or 4 another? 5 A No, I could comment on it that there's a 6 significant risk to people that are exposed to that 7 compound. 8 Q Okay. Let's go back to your report. Put 9 aside, at least for now, the CARD Clinic Web page 10 printout, and you have the TDP over there. 11 Okay. You see at paragraph 22 in your 12 report? 13 A Paragraph 22? 14 Q Paragraph 22, Page 10. 15 A I do. 16 Q You're describing the impact on asbestos 17 disease due to Libby asbestos exposure. Do you see 18 that? 19 A Yes. 20 Q In that paragraph, you're talking about the 21 progression of non-malignant disease; is that 22 correct? 23 A That's correct. 24 Q Okay. At the last sentence, you write, At 25 the end stage, the patient is bedridden, oxygen</p>

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 dependent, and generally the hypoxia will lead to</p> <p>2 organ malfunction and death.</p> <p>3 Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And just for purposes of the record, please</p> <p>6 define hypoxia.</p> <p>7 A Hypoxia is a low -- low oxygen level beyond</p> <p>8 the lower limits of what is considered to be normal.</p> <p>9 Q Now, when someone reaches the point -- would</p> <p>10 you agree with me that people that -- shortness of</p> <p>11 breath is a symptom. Someone comes -- a patient</p> <p>12 comes to you and says, I'm having problems breathing.</p> <p>13 That's a symptom that a patient describes to a</p> <p>14 doctor, correct?</p> <p>15 A Correct.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Now, a doctor can do a variety of lung</p> <p>17 function tests to see how their lung function has</p> <p>18 been impacted and may be causing shortness of breath,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A They don't usually start there though.</p> <p>21 Q Where do they usually start?</p> <p>22 A The physical history and physical exam.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. So you do the physical history and the</p> <p>24 physical exam, and then at some point, you do a</p> <p>25 series of lung function tests, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 fact that we don't know where they started from. You</p> <p>2 start with healthy people who have been hard working</p> <p>3 all their life, particularly people who've done</p> <p>4 physical labor. You may find normal values that are</p> <p>5 in the range of 140 percent of predicted, and so then</p> <p>6 you cannot always assume that somebody that has 100</p> <p>7 percent of predicted that that's normal for them,</p> <p>8 that they may have lost 40 percent, but you have no</p> <p>9 way of knowing that, but that may correlate with</p> <p>10 their shortness of breath.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. I understand that that's sometimes</p> <p>12 called the healthy worker phenomenon where the people</p> <p>13 that may be outliers in the sense that they started</p> <p>14 out at 120 percent of predicted or 140 percent of</p> <p>15 predicted, they can lose a significant amount of</p> <p>16 their lung function, but would still show up as,</p> <p>17 quote, normal on a spirometry test or a lung capacity</p> <p>18 test?</p> <p>19 A They could, although I've never seen that</p> <p>20 term healthy worker used that way.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Let's say if you took somebody who was</p> <p>22 a subforeman, they may have super optimal lung</p> <p>23 capacity and that guy might be, say, 150 percent of</p> <p>24 predicted and lose 50 percent of his lung capacity</p> <p>25 and still show up as 100 percent of predicted as a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 A Correct.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And the lung function test that you</p> <p>3 normally do in someone who's an asbestos-exposed</p> <p>4 person would be what?</p> <p>5 A Well, we do, routinely, spirometry before and</p> <p>6 after bronchodilator, lung volumes in a body</p> <p>7 plethysmograph and diffusion capacities.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Diffusion capacities is sometimes</p> <p>9 called DLCO?</p> <p>10 A Never heard that used. D-L-C-O.</p> <p>11 Q D-L-C-O.</p> <p>12 And how do -- and would you agree with me</p> <p>13 that the patient's score on the various lung function</p> <p>14 tests that you administer provide an objective</p> <p>15 measurement as to how, if at all, their lung function</p> <p>16 has been affected or damaged, correct?</p> <p>17 A It may.</p> <p>18 Q It may.</p> <p>19 So there could be people who genuinely and</p> <p>20 truthfully and honestly say, I'm experiencing</p> <p>21 shortness of breath, yet when you do a total lung</p> <p>22 capacity or forced vital capacity or DLCO, the lung</p> <p>23 function tests could be in -- you know, within the</p> <p>24 normal ranges, correct?</p> <p>25 A Well, the problem that you describe is the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 normal population even though he's suffered lung</p> <p>2 function, correct?</p> <p>3 A That's possible, although, you know, he's not</p> <p>4 going to be running four minute miles any more.</p> <p>5 Q I rather suspected that.</p> <p>6 But would you agree with me that the way</p> <p>7 the -- what does it mean to be -- to be above the</p> <p>8 lower limit of normal?</p> <p>9 A Well, the problem -- I don't know if it's a</p> <p>10 problem with lung function tests, but lung function</p> <p>11 tests have to be -- they don't get interpreted in a</p> <p>12 vacuum meaning the nominal norms plus or minus two</p> <p>13 standard deviations, which is a range of 80 to 120</p> <p>14 percent, there's at least twenty different sets of</p> <p>15 normal values out there that have been done over the</p> <p>16 years and --</p> <p>17 Q You're speaking of the reference equation?</p> <p>18 A Yeah, the reference equations and all, so,</p> <p>19 you know, the ones that I use and the ones that have</p> <p>20 been used for timing memorial for a lung function,</p> <p>21 probably the most commonly used ones, but there's</p> <p>22 always change in it, and so you have to interpret</p> <p>23 your pulmonary function studies in light of what you</p> <p>24 know about the patient and the problems and all</p> <p>25 that -- all the variety of stuff that goes into doing</p>

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 a diagnostic workup on somebody.</p> <p>2 Q But you mentioned two standard deviations</p> <p>3 from normal. Do you understand that basically 95</p> <p>4 percent of the people are going to fall between 80</p> <p>5 percent of predicted and 120 percent of predicted?</p> <p>6 A Yeah, I think that's what it is, yeah.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that if</p> <p>8 someone dies from -- well, how does the non-malignant</p> <p>9 asbestos diseases caused by Libby asbestos lead to</p> <p>10 death? What does it do physiologically to the person</p> <p>11 that kills them?</p> <p>12 A It leads to a number of things. It leads to</p> <p>13 progressive shortness of breath. Most of them seem</p> <p>14 to die of -- not most of them, but a large number of</p> <p>15 them die of severe loss of lung volume, so they wind</p> <p>16 up with vital capacities in the 30 to 40 percent</p> <p>17 range of predicted or they wind up with diffusion</p> <p>18 capacities down to 20 or 30 percent.</p> <p>19 So they either -- for the most part, either</p> <p>20 die of hypoxia with carbon dioxide retention or they</p> <p>21 die of what's called a cor pulmonale which is heart</p> <p>22 failure due to pulmonary hypertension disease within</p> <p>23 their asbestos disease.</p> <p>24 Q But would you agree with me that the majority</p> <p>25 of people who die from a non-malignant disease caused</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 A Well, there was 110 of them that died either</p> <p>2 with lung cancer that was related to that or with</p> <p>3 pleural or interstitial disease. Asbestos disease</p> <p>4 was non-malignant.</p> <p>5 Q Right. The 110 include people who died of</p> <p>6 cancer, right?</p> <p>7 A It did.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And my understanding is of the 110, 76</p> <p>9 of them died from -- and by that, I'll use quotes --</p> <p>10 died from a non-malignant disease as opposed to a</p> <p>11 cancer?</p> <p>12 A That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Of the 76 people who died from a</p> <p>14 non-malignant disease, would you agree with me that</p> <p>15 the majority of them by the end stage, but a few days</p> <p>16 before they died, if you measured their lung</p> <p>17 function, it would be well below 60 percent of</p> <p>18 predicted?</p> <p>19 A Which numbers are you talking about?</p> <p>20 Q Total lung capacity, forced vital capacity or</p> <p>21 DLCO.</p> <p>22 A Yeah, well, I think that's probably right</p> <p>23 because we had almost 50 percent of them that had</p> <p>24 DLCO as their isolated abnormality and they may have</p> <p>25 had minor degrees of lung -- volume loss, but they</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 by exposure to asbestos, at the end stage, they will</p> <p>2 have lung function test scores that are significantly</p> <p>3 below the lower limits of normal, at least on one of</p> <p>4 the three tests you mentioned?</p> <p>5 A Well, most of the time. There have been rare</p> <p>6 examples of people that will have only modest degrees</p> <p>7 of loss of lung function and develop severe hypoxia</p> <p>8 associated with that because hypoxia does not</p> <p>9 directly correlate with the lung function test.</p> <p>10 Q Meaning you can be -- you can still for</p> <p>11 whatever reason be able to get more oxygen in through</p> <p>12 your blood even if you have decreased lung function</p> <p>13 and, conversely, you can have not so significant lung</p> <p>14 function decline, but less oxygen in your blood?</p> <p>15 A Right.</p> <p>16 Q But for the majority of people who die from</p> <p>17 Libby -- you did something called the CARD mortality</p> <p>18 study, correct?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And I think the numbers are right here.</p> <p>21 Basically, you determined out of 186 people who had</p> <p>22 died who had at one time been diagnosed with an</p> <p>23 asbestos-related disease, that 110 of them, their</p> <p>24 death was caused in whole or in part by exposure to</p> <p>25 Libby asbestos; is that right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 had a very severe defusion defect.</p> <p>2 Q Could you pick up the TDP which is an exhibit</p> <p>3 to your deposition? I'm not sure what number it is.</p> <p>4 MR. LEWIS: Two.</p> <p>5 Q (By Mr. Finch) Number two. I have reviewed</p> <p>6 your reports and your criticisms of the TDP. I</p> <p>7 didn't see any criticisms of the amounts of money</p> <p>8 that are scheduled to be paid on expedited review to</p> <p>9 people that qualify for various levels of disease; is</p> <p>10 that correct?</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: Object. That's beyond his</p> <p>12 expertise. We're not talking about that question to</p> <p>13 this witness.</p> <p>14 MR. FINCH: Well, let me just establish</p> <p>15 that.</p> <p>16 Q (By Mr. Finch) You don't have any expertise</p> <p>17 in the dollar amounts that asbestos bankruptcy trusts</p> <p>18 pay to resolve asbestos personal injury claims, do</p> <p>19 you?</p> <p>20 A No, they just -- they seemed a little bit</p> <p>21 paltry to me, but I'm not -- I'm not an expert in</p> <p>22 that.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And you're not an expert in what kind</p> <p>24 of values Grace paid when it was a defendant in the</p> <p>25 tort system, both to people in Libby and people</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 elsewhere? You're not offering any opinions about 2 that?</p> <p>3 A As to how much they have paid?</p> <p>4 Q Yes.</p> <p>5 A I have a few numbers in my head from prior 6 trials, but that's all. That's not enough to draw 7 any long-term conclusions probably.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And so what -- as I understand it, 9 what you focused on was the medical and exposure 10 criteria for certain of the diseases in the TDP, 11 correct?</p> <p>12 A Yeah, I try to stick with things that I know.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And I read all of your reports and I 14 didn't see in any of your reports in the Grace 15 bankruptcy case any criticism of the exposure 16 requirements, is that correct, for Libby claimants, 17 at least?</p> <p>18 A No, actually, it probably isn't dealt with in 19 there, although that six-month criteria in there I 20 think is subject to knowing what I know to a fair 21 amount of criticism and mainly because of people that 22 have vacationed there for a few weeks or so and then 23 wound up with severe asbestos with interstitial lung 24 disease. In fact, I've got one particular patient 25 that does have that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 and all.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Now, the TDP was not drafted by you, 3 obviously, correct?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q Have you ever drafted trust distribution 6 procedures for any kind of a bankruptcy trust?</p> <p>7 A No, and I don't want to.</p> <p>8 Q Would you agree with me that it's not purely 9 a medical document?</p> <p>10 A I'm not sure I could even answer that. I 11 know it's designed as a way to distribute money to 12 people who are injured, but I'm not sure what I would 13 actually call it.</p> <p>14 Q Well, it has -- do you understand that the 15 medical and exposure criteria are presumptive 16 criteria so that if someone satisfies them, the trust 17 will offer them a settlement in the values in the 18 grid? Do you understand that?</p> <p>19 MR. LEWIS: I'm going to -- I'm going 20 to object to this on the grounds that this witness is 21 not qualified to answer the question, and based on 22 his prior testimony, there's no foundation for -- to 23 ask the question.</p> <p>24 Q (By Mr. Finch) You can answer.</p> <p>25 A Repeat the question for me.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 Q But you haven't -- you know, understand that 2 the purpose of the report though is to lay out your 3 criticisms so I can ask you the basis for them. You 4 haven't anywhere in your report, as I read them, 5 criticized the exposure criteria in the TDP.</p> <p>6 A The exposure criteria as far as time or the 7 extent of exposure?</p> <p>8 Q Either or.</p> <p>9 A Or level of exposure?</p> <p>10 Q Either one.</p> <p>11 A Well, the level of exposures are not well 12 known. And we know that the miners had a lot 13 exposure, but we don't know the level of exposure 14 that is required to get significant pleural disease. 15 We think it's pretty small, but we don't -- we don't 16 have exact numbers on any of that.</p> <p>17 Q But my question is a little bit more 18 technical than that.</p> <p>19 You just haven't -- I didn't see anywhere in 20 any of your reports you writing down and saying, I am 21 criticizing the definition of Grace's exposure or in 22 the six months requirement in the TDP.</p> <p>23 A No, I have not and I think that that's better 24 left to people that are -- that know a lot about 25 exposure and things like that about asbestos levels</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 Q I'll reask it.</p> <p>2 Do you understand that the medical and 3 exposure criteria in the TDP are set so that if 4 people meet them for -- let's pick any of the 5 particular disease levels -- if they meet them for 6 that disease, the trust will offer them a settlement 7 in the amount of money shown in the schedule values? 8 Do you have that understanding that's how the thing 9 works?</p> <p>10 MR. LEWIS: Object on the prior basis 11 and also on the grounds that it's compound.</p> <p>12 A Well, I assume so, but I'm not sure I know 13 enough to know how it actually works when it comes 14 right down to it. Who gets paid what for how much or 15 what the pitfalls are in it or things like that. I 16 know some of the pitfalls, but I don't know all of 17 them.</p> <p>18 Q (By Mr. Finch) Okay. You don't have any 19 expertise in evaluating asbestos personal injury 20 claims for purposes of whether or not you should 21 settle them or not, do you?</p> <p>22 A You mean from a legal standpoint?</p> <p>23 Q Yes.</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q Do you have any understanding as to what</p>

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 happens with someone who has, let's say, a 2 non-malignant disease that the TDP would call 3 asbestos pleural disease level three and they submit 4 a claim to the trust and they qualify, if they later 5 get sicker and their lung function test scores 6 decline further from what they were at the time they 7 settled with the trust, whether or not they can come 8 back and make a new claim for the trust and get more 9 money? 10 A I do not know the answer to that. 11 Q Okay. One of your opinions, as I understand 12 it, about how Libby -- a non-malignant asbestos 13 disease caused by exposure to Libby asbestos, how 14 that is different than non-malignant asbestos disease 15 caused by exposure to, let's say, chrysotile asbestos 16 is that the pleural disease is more progressive. 17 You've written those words? 18 A Yes. 19 Q What do you mean by more progressive? 20 A There are good documentation now that we have 21 watched the disease progress far more rapidly, and 22 particularly when I compare it with my past 23 experience than what's described or what's actually 24 described in the literature, cases in which there's 25 been progression from fairly modest disease to death</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 A Yes. 2 Q I haven't seen anywhere in your reports or in 3 the medical literature an analysis of if you took all 4 of those 1,800 people and tracked their lung function 5 over time what, if any, decline you would see; is 6 that correct? 7 A No, I haven't, and several reasons for that. 8 First off, I did -- as you know, have a database for 9 a while that was basically tracking the same sort of 10 thing as in that paper. 11 Q That was a database of 550 people? 12 A Or whatever it was. I don't know. It's been 13 called that by you guys. I don't think there was 14 550. I don't remember. Stopped using it because it 15 was so sporadic. When I started working up at Libby 16 eight days a month in 2004, closed my office, it sort 17 of became irrelevant because we had a new database up 18 there and it got to -- when I was in my office, then 19 I would track them all because they were almost all 20 down in my office, not all of them, but most of them, 21 but then it just got so sporadic, so we didn't follow 22 it anymore. 23 I have not -- we do not have a database that 24 is adequate at this point at Libby to track that 25 18- -- the whole 1,800. And as you can imagine, a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 within short periods of time, several years. I think 2 that's sort of the gist of it, and that happens 3 frequently. 4 Q And by progression, do you mean a decline in 5 lung function? 6 A Well, not necessarily. It may be a decline 7 in lung function. It may be a significant change in 8 the chest x-ray. 9 We have one of the largest data banks of 10 CT -- HRCTs, high resolution CAT scans on asbestos 11 patients anywhere. We have CTs on practically 12 everybody. We have multiple CTs. So we have that 13 data, so we can measure what's actually happened in 14 various parts of the lung. 15 And so when I say that we're seeing 16 progression in a lot of people, we are. And why some 17 do and some don't, I have no idea. 18 Q Okay. You did a paper in 2004 where you 19 tracked the progression of decline in lung function 20 test scores for 123 of your patients, correct? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. Have you -- there are approximately 23 1,800 people that have been diagnosed with asbestos 24 disease in the CARD Clinic as a result of being 25 exposed to Libby asbestos?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 lot of it's bogged down in bureaucracy and grant 2 things that we have no control over. 3 Q So to the extent that you have opinions that 4 pleural disease caused by exposure to Libby asbestos 5 is more -- leads to a more rapid decline in lung 6 function than pleural disease caused by exposure to 7 other types of asbestos, is it fair to say that's 8 primarily based upon the 2004 paper you wrote? 9 A No, not entirely. I think, to explain that 10 statement, first off, is we have a preponderance of 11 pleural disease. My experience in looking at people 12 from Hanford is that I really only had a couple of 13 deaths in all of the years that I was doing that of 14 Hanford workers and it was all from severe 15 interstitial disease. There just -- there wasn't 16 that much significant pleural disease, whereas, in 17 Libby there's a tremendous amount of pleural disease. 18 And so you would expect, I think, the extent 19 of it, that there would be people who will progress 20 and die of that disease. 21 I have numbers from the mortality study which 22 is only patients in CARD that died, so we had -- have 23 good data on it. There's a lot of other ones that 24 have died of pleural disease prior to that time, but 25 there has not been a definitive study on the whole --</p>

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 of all the claimants of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Heberling's 2 that that's been done. Probably at some point in 3 time, it will get done. 4 Q Okay. Have you done anything to analyze the 5 differences in either the type of disease that people 6 have or how severe it is as compared between 7 Mr. Heberling's and Mr. Lewis' clients and the 850 8 people who aren't -- who have Libby asbestos disease 9 who aren't their clients to see if there are any 10 differences between those two groups? 11 A No, we haven't done a formal study of that. 12 Q Do you have any expertise or knowledge as to 13 whether there are qualitative differences between 14 asbestos disease patients who decide to pursue a 15 lawsuit as compared to asbestos disease patients who 16 don't in terms of their disease severity? 17 A I can't answer that question. I know that 18 there was a whole flurry of lawsuits very early on in 19 this process, but whether or not there was more than 20 there would have been in the rest of the community or 21 not, I don't know. 22 Q So you can't say whether the 950 people who 23 are clients of Mr. Heberling or Mr. Lewis are 24 different in significant ways from the 800 people who 25 have Libby asbestos disease or not?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 type of asbestos-related non-malignant disease is not 2 something that exists only as a result of being 3 exposed to Libby asbestos, correct? 4 A No, that's correct. 5 Q And you on Page 29 -- 6 A Page 29 or paragraph 29? 7 Q Excuse me. Paragraph 29. 8 A Yes. 9 Q You're citing to something called the 10 Rosenstock text? 11 A Yes. 12 Q What is the Rosenstock text? 13 A That's a textbook by a lady in -- who's a 14 research physician at the University of Washington 15 and she's still there. 16 Q Do you know what, if any, role Dr. Laura 17 Welch* had in working on or editing that medical 18 textbook? 19 A I do not. 20 Q The Rosenstock -- you cite the Rosenstock 21 text for the proposition, In contrast to the mild 22 effect of plaques on lung function, diffuse pleural 23 thickening may result in more significant restrictive 24 respiratory impairment. 25 I take it you agree with that statement?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 A I'm not in a position to make that -- any 2 judgments on that. I do think that there are 950 3 claimants that they have who I know -- probably do 4 know better because I've seen them more times are 5 likely to follow the same path as the 110 that were 6 in that mortality study. 7 Q That's your -- let me back up. 8 On paragraph 27 of your report, Page 13, you 9 write, An overwhelming majority in the Libby cohort 10 have not only pleural plaques, but also diffuse 11 pleural thickening, a more serious form of pleural 12 disease. 13 Do you see that? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Would you agree with me that diffuse pleural 16 thickening is a disease process that has been 17 described in the medical literature for at least 18 thirty years? 19 A That's probably for thirty years, yeah, most 20 of the stuff that I've read has been since the '80s. 21 Well, 1980s. That's thirty years, isn't it? 22 Q 1980 is almost thirty years ago, 23 unfortunately. 24 A That's what happens as you get older. 25 Q So diffuse pleural thickening as a disease, a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 A Yeah, that's a fair statement. 2 Q Okay. By plaques, I assume that you're 3 talking about pleural plaques? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that -- well, 6 how would -- would you agree with me that pleural 7 plaques by -- well, let me get some definitions. 8 What is your understanding of the term 9 pleural plaque? 10 A Well, the pleural plaque is originally and 11 currently, I guess, defined as -- or defined as an 12 area of scarring and fibrosis generally on the 13 parietal pleural with demarcated edges, and it 14 doesn't really define the size of it very much, 15 although for practical standpoints, most of them are 16 four or five centimeters in diameter at the largest 17 for the most part. 18 Q And would you agree with me that -- and I 19 guess the Rosenstock text states this -- is that 20 generally speaking pleural plaques only have a mild 21 effect, if any, on lung function? 22 A You have to define pleural plaques under 23 those terms as isolated non-confluent pleural 24 plaques. 25 Q Would you agree with me that pleural plaques</p>

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 have been defined in the medical literature for at 2 least thirty years as well? 3 A Yes, they have. 4 MR. FINCH: Okay. We have been going a 5 little over an hour. I don't know about you, but I 6 like to try and take a short break at least once an 7 hour. Would this be a good time? I think this is a 8 good time for me to break. Would you like to take a 9 break? 10 THE WITNESS: Sure, whatever you want. 11 MR. FINCH: Okay. Why don't we take a 12 five- or ten-minute break? 13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the 14 record. The time is now 9:32 a.m. 15 (Recess.) 16 (Ms. Bloom exits.) 17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the 18 record. The time is now 9:43 a.m. 19 (Exhibit-5 marked for 20 identification.) 21 EXAMINATION (Continuing) 22 BY MR. FINCH: 23 Q Dr. Whitehouse, do you have the Whitehouse 24 Deposition Exhibit-5 in front of you? 25 A The what?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 Q So it talks about different diseases 2 caused -- different non-malignant diseases caused by 3 exposure to asbestos, correct? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Would you also agree with me that the 2004 6 ATS statement on non-malignant asbestos-related 7 diseases doesn't provide any guidance for how you 8 would divide a non-malignant disease by severity as 9 it relates to lung function decline? 10 A I'm not sure I understand your question. 11 Q Yeah, it was a crummy question. Let me 12 rephrase it. 13 You would agree with me that demonstration of 14 functional impairment as shown by either spirometry 15 or total lung capacity or DLCO is not a requirement 16 to diagnose somebody with a non-malignant 17 asbestos-related disease, correct? 18 A That's true. 19 Q So you can have asbestosis or pleural disease 20 and have completely normal lung function tests, 21 correct? 22 A That's true. 23 Q And so the 2004 ATS statement, whatever else 24 it does, it doesn't give you any guidance as to how 25 you would characterize someone as having -- for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 Q The Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-5 in front 2 of you. 3 A Oh, yes, I do. 4 Q And do you recognize that document, sir? 5 A I do. 6 Q What is Whitehouse-5? 7 A That's the ATS. I think this is the -- is 8 this the '04 statement? 9 Q Yes. 10 A I assume it is, yes. 11 Q Okay. This is the American Thoracic Society 12 Diagnosis and Initial Management of Non-Malignant 13 Diseases Related to the Asbestos. Do you see that? 14 A That's correct. 15 Q Do you regard these guidelines for the 16 diagnosis and management of non-malignant diseases to 17 be authoritative? 18 A Yes. 19 Q Do you rely on them when you're diagnosing 20 people with asbestos-related disease? 21 A Yes, I actually follow what they do, what 22 they say. 23 Q Would you agree with me that this document 24 uses the word diseases, plural, in the title? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 purposes of lung function decline perspective, 2 whether they have severe asbestosis or severe pleural 3 disease, it doesn't speak to that, does it? 4 A No. 5 Q It doesn't give you any tests or ranges for 6 lung function test scores to say this person is 7 mildly impaired, this person is severely impaired, or 8 this person is not impaired at all, correct? 9 A No, I don't think it does. 10 Q Okay. There's something called the AM -- 11 American Medical Association Guides for the 12 Evaluation of Permanent Impairment. Are you familiar 13 with those? 14 A Yes. 15 Q I think that you recently put out a sixth 16 edition, but you cite to the fifth edition in your 17 paper? 18 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 19 Q And you rely on that as one basis for 20 dividing disease by severity as it relates to lung 21 function loss? 22 A I rely on that only insofar as I'm required 23 to for disability evaluations for the State of 24 Montana. 25 Q Okay.</p>

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 A Other than that, I do not.</p> <p>2 Q Do you understand that the TDP divides the</p> <p>3 non-malignant -- the Grace TDP divides the</p> <p>4 non-malignant diseases by severity in terms of the</p> <p>5 decline in lung function test scores?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. So there's a low level criteria where</p> <p>8 it doesn't require any kind of lung function decline</p> <p>9 at all, correct?</p> <p>10 A Right.</p> <p>11 Q And that would be category one or category</p> <p>12 two, correct?</p> <p>13 A And I'd have to look up all the categories</p> <p>14 again because there's As and Bs and --</p> <p>15 Q Why don't --</p> <p>16 A -- things like that, but, yes, take your word</p> <p>17 for it.</p> <p>18 Q The 2004 ATS statement, if you could turn in</p> <p>19 there to Page 697.</p> <p>20 A Okay.</p> <p>21 Q The second full paragraph on Page 697 refers</p> <p>22 to something called HRCT. Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Second on which side?</p> <p>24 Q On 697.</p> <p>25 A Yeah.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 classification in both interstitial and pleural</p> <p>2 disease with a variety of diseases originally</p> <p>3 starting in pneumoconiosis and black lung and coal</p> <p>4 miner's lung and then has been extrapolated as</p> <p>5 asbestos disease subsequent to that.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And is it -- it is a -- it is a</p> <p>7 grading system for dividing chest radiographs for</p> <p>8 pneumoconiosis caused by exposure to asbestos and</p> <p>9 various categories, correct?</p> <p>10 A Correct.</p> <p>11 Q It's one of the things that it does?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And have you ever in your clinical practice</p> <p>14 or otherwise used the ILO system in describing a</p> <p>15 chest x-ray, what a chest x-ray shows to another</p> <p>16 doctor?</p> <p>17 A Well, yes, I -- actually, the part of the ILO</p> <p>18 system that relates to interstitial lung disease, I</p> <p>19 pretty much agree with. That's the 1/0, 1/1, 2/1,</p> <p>20 et cetera, et cetera of interstitial disease.</p> <p>21 There's far more difficulty with the pleural disease,</p> <p>22 particularly as far as what people see and how they</p> <p>23 read it and things like that.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that in</p> <p>25 reading chest x-rays generally, two people who are</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 Q Second full paragraph begins, HRCT and detect</p> <p>2 early --</p> <p>3 A Okay.</p> <p>4 Q -- pleural thickening.</p> <p>5 A I got it.</p> <p>6 Q Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q HRCT refers to high resolution CAT scans --</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q -- computed tomography?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And then later on in the same column</p> <p>13 in the next paragraph, the 2004 ATS statement authors</p> <p>14 write, A proposal has been put forward for a</p> <p>15 classification system analogous to that of the ILO</p> <p>16 system for plain chest radiographs, but none has been</p> <p>17 widely adopted.</p> <p>18 Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q This document was published in 2004. To your</p> <p>21 knowledge, has there -- well, let me back up.</p> <p>22 What's your understanding of what's the ILO</p> <p>23 system for plain crest radiographs?</p> <p>24 A Well, the ILO system is an epidemiologic</p> <p>25 study or was designed as an epidemiologic study for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 equally qualified and competent at reviewing x-rays</p> <p>2 can come to different conclusions as to whether or</p> <p>3 not the -- what the profusion level is on the ILO</p> <p>4 scale for purposes of interstitial disease?</p> <p>5 A Yes, they can.</p> <p>6 Q That's a phenomenon called interreader</p> <p>7 variability?</p> <p>8 A True.</p> <p>9 Q And would you also agree with me that same</p> <p>10 phenomenon, i.e., two doctors looking at the same</p> <p>11 x-ray that shows pleural disease can with the best</p> <p>12 will in the world come to different conclusions about</p> <p>13 what that x-ray shows?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q But the -- do you have an understanding of</p> <p>16 how the ILO guidelines are promulgated?</p> <p>17 A You mean originally or --</p> <p>18 Q Well, originally and then -- let's back up.</p> <p>19 They were originally put out in 1980,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Yeah.</p> <p>22 Q All right. Do you have an understanding of</p> <p>23 how they came into existence?</p> <p>24 A Oh, a bit, not a lot. They came in -- I'm</p> <p>25 not sure that I do know. I think they came about</p>

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 because of trying to use it as a goal for disability 2 for coal miners was the original which is why 3 (inaudible), West Virginia, and I suspect that's -- I 4 think that's how it originally started. I'm not 5 absolutely certain of all that. 6 Q And one of the goals was that it was to 7 create sort of a unified system of rules for how you 8 can describe chest x-rays to another doctor in a way 9 that's shorthand as opposed to both of you having to 10 look at the film, correct? 11 A Yes, I guess -- I guess that was the original 12 reason. I don't know the -- that one in particular, 13 I'm not sure whether that was an original goal or 14 not. 15 Q Okay. And what is your understanding of how 16 the -- and the ILO was revised in about the year 17 2000, correct? 18 A Yes. 19 Q It became publically available sometime after 20 that? 21 A It became what? 22 Q Publically available. The ILO guidelines 23 from the year 2000 became publically available 24 sometime after the year 2000, right? 25 A Well, I know they're publically available.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 doctor was asked to give an opinion about whether or 2 not someone had pleural thickening versus pleural 3 plaque, that doctor relied on the definition of 4 pleural thickening in the ILO -- 2000 ILO guidelines 5 that he or she was operating completely out of the 6 bounds of mainstream medical science? 7 A They would be operating with what's written 8 in the ILO guidelines. 9 Q And that would be acceptable medical 10 practice, correct? 11 A That's a whole other issue because there's 12 significant differences between what the ILO 13 guidelines are and certain diffuse pleural thickening 14 and confluent plaques and things like that that are 15 at issue with the problems of these people that died 16 with Libby asbestos. 17 Q But I understand that you have some 18 criticisms of the way the 2000 ILO guidelines defined 19 pleural thickening versus pleural plaque, I take it? 20 A Yes. 21 Q But you wouldn't say that a doctor who relied 22 on the 2000 ILO guidelines for purposes of deciding 23 whether someone had pleural plaques or pleural 24 thickening was being completely arbitrary and not 25 following accepted medical science?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 Were they not before that? 2 Q At some point in the year 2000, the ILO 3 guidelines were revised, correct? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Did you have any role in revising those 6 guidelines? 7 A Not at all. 8 Q Do you have an understanding as to who the 9 people were that made the revisions to those 10 guidelines? 11 A Not all of them, no. 12 Q Do you understand that at least some of the 13 people involved were experts in asbestos-related 14 medical issues? 15 A Oh, I believe they were, yes. 16 Q You wouldn't say that the -- if a doctor were 17 to rely on the ILO guidelines for purposes of 18 defining pleural disease that that doctor is outside 19 the medical mainstream, would you? 20 A Well, probably not, although there are -- 21 becoming evident with time more discrepancies 22 relative to that particularly when you review the 23 literature. There are -- well, there's exceptions to 24 everything as you can imagine. 25 Q But you wouldn't say, for example, if a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 A Those are two different parts of the 2 question. I think you should separate them. 3 Q Okay. Would you say that someone who relies 4 on the 2000 ILO guidelines is not following accepted 5 medical practice if they follow those definitions for 6 purposes of trying to determine -- give an opinion 7 about whether someone has diffuse pleural thickening 8 or pleural plaques? 9 A No, they would be following the guidelines. 10 Q And that would be acceptable medical practice 11 to do so? 12 A I think there's very large exceptions in that 13 relative to Libby asbestos and there's also a fair 14 number or significant amount of exceptions to that in 15 the medical literature, particularly McCloud, and 16 we're talking -- we're talking about blunting and 17 diffuse pleural thickening, so we might as well cut 18 to the -- cut to the meat of this. 19 Q Sure. 20 A And McCloud only found, I think, 45 percent 21 of the people had blunting with diffuse pleural 22 thickening. I think there's one other where I can't 23 remember the name of who wrote it in a similar vein. 24 It also wrote that everybody that had diffuse pleural 25 thickening had a prior pleural effusion and there's</p>

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 evidence in the literature that that -- there are 2 more than one view of that, and for whatever reasons 3 and I obviously wasn't privy to any of those 4 discussions, they selected that piece of information 5 as opposed to McCloud's article which very well 6 details the incidence of blunting associated with 7 diffuse pleural thickening. 8 And that amazingly correlates almost exactly 9 with what we have in Libby in these people who died. 10 MR. BERNICK: I'm sorry. Your voice 11 trailed off a little bit, Dr. Whitehouse. What 12 corresponded almost identically with the -- 13 THE WITNESS: Oh, the McCloud numbers 14 correlate almost exactly with the Libby numbers for 15 the incidents of blunting as a criteria for diffuse 16 pleural thickening. We have all these people with 17 diffuse pleural thickening that don't have blunting. 18 Q (By Mr. Finch) Okay. Mr. Bernick probably 19 has lots of questions about diffuse pleural 20 thickening and blunting, but I'm just asking you in 21 general -- 22 MR. BERNICK: Don't count on it. 23 Q (By Mr. Finch) In general, if someone 24 followed the ILO guidelines requirement for saying 25 that blunting would be required to define something</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 Q Okay. 2 A There is -- we actually -- other people in 3 the CARD clinic are actually working on this and 4 trying to develop something that is simple because 5 the one that's out there takes over an hour to do a 6 CT, and if you think about that, you can read a CT in 7 about five or ten minutes and then you take an hour 8 and -- it isn't going to happen. 9 Q Nobody would use it? 10 A Nobody will use it, no. 11 Q Well -- 12 A That's exactly what's happened. 13 Q Okay. So, I mean, my understanding of the 14 ILO -- the way the ILO system works is it's a big box 15 with sample films in it that you can compare 1/1 16 versus whatever x-ray you're looking at to see how 17 those two things line up. Is that basically how it 18 works? 19 A Supposedly. 20 Q Okay. Supposedly and theoretically, that's 21 how it works, right? 22 A Theoretically, that's how it works. 23 Q Okay. Some doctors follow that to a greater 24 or lesser degree, right? 25 A I would agree with you on that.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 as diffuse pleural thickening, that person would not 2 be outside of the bounds of generally accepted 3 medical practice, correct? 4 A Probably not. 5 Q Now, before we got into the discussion of 6 blunting, there -- I'm still at the 2004 ATS 7 statement. The statement says, A proposal has been 8 put forward for a classification system analogous to 9 that of the ILO system for plain chest radiographs, 10 but none has been widely adopted. 11 Do you see that language? 12 A Yeah. 13 Q And what they're referring to is a proposal 14 has been put forward for a way to grade HRCT in a way 15 that is descriptive much like the ILO system is 16 descriptive for chest x-rays, correct? 17 A Correct. 18 Q Okay. And this statement was put out -- 19 well, the date on it is December 12, 2003, but that's 20 almost six years ago. 21 To your knowledge, has there been a widely 22 adopted way to classify high resolution CAT scans of 23 the chest that is similar to the ILO system for 24 x-rays? 25 A It hasn't been widely adopted.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 Q Okay. But -- and there's not something 2 similarly developed yet where somebody can quickly 3 and easily take a picture of HRCT and this is what a 4 1/1 should look like or the equivalent of this is 5 what diffuse pleural thickening should look like and 6 compare it to some kind of master image that is 7 widely adopted or easy to use, right? 8 A No, there isn't anything out there like that 9 yet. 10 Q Okay. On Page 697, there is a column -- in 11 the second column, there's something called -- the 12 heading is Pulmonary Function Tests. Do you see 13 that? 14 A Mm-hm, I do. 15 Q The third paragraph in that section says, In 16 addition to diminished lung volumes, the carbon 17 monoxide diffusing capacity is commonly reduced due 18 to diminished alveolar-capillary gas diffusion as 19 well as ventilation-perfusion mismatching. 20 Do you see that? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. And then it goes on to say, Although a 23 low diffusing capacity for carbon monoxide is often 24 reported as the most sensitive indicator of early 25 asbestosis, it is also a relatively non-specific</p>

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 finding.</p> <p>2 Do you agree with that statement?</p> <p>3 A I don't entirely because I would agree that</p> <p>4 it's not a specific finding because there's basically</p> <p>5 two categories of things that will modify the</p> <p>6 diffusion capacity, but that could be separated out</p> <p>7 pretty quickly with the pulmonary function studies as</p> <p>8 to the etiology of the diffusion capacity</p> <p>9 abnormality.</p> <p>10 Q Well, first, there's -- actually, there's</p> <p>11 really two statements in that sentence, right, Dr.</p> <p>12 Whitehouse?</p> <p>13 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>14 Q The first one is a low diffusing capacity for</p> <p>15 carbon monoxide is often reported as the most</p> <p>16 sensitive indicator of early asbestosis.</p> <p>17 Now, do you agree with that?</p> <p>18 A I do agree with that that's a very</p> <p>19 sensitive -- not necessarily early asbestosis, but it</p> <p>20 may be the only indicator of pulmonary functionwise</p> <p>21 to correlate what you're seeing radiographically.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And sensitive and specific have</p> <p>23 defined meanings within the field of epidemiology,</p> <p>24 correct? Or let me back up.</p> <p>25 Sensitive and specific have defined meanings</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 mismatches and interstitial lung disease, whether</p> <p>2 seen or not seen on the film. Those are the two big</p> <p>3 factors.</p> <p>4 Q That affect that DLCO?</p> <p>5 A Those are the two things that affect.</p> <p>6 Q And obstructive disease can be caused by many</p> <p>7 things other than asbestos exposure, correct?</p> <p>8 A True, except that a recent article on</p> <p>9 obstructive disease was the most common abnormality</p> <p>10 associated with asbestos disease. I mean it was the</p> <p>11 most common pulmonary function abnormality. There's</p> <p>12 an article by O'Hare* about that.</p> <p>13 Q But you would agree with me there are lots of</p> <p>14 things that can cause obstructive disease in the</p> <p>15 lungs that aren't asbestos related?</p> <p>16 A Surely.</p> <p>17 Q I mean, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease</p> <p>18 is something that can happen as a result of smoking,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A It may be due to emphysema due to smoking,</p> <p>21 but it may be also a manifestation of asbestos</p> <p>22 disease.</p> <p>23 Q What else -- what other -- what other things</p> <p>24 can cause obstructive disease other than asbestos</p> <p>25 exposure?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 within the medical literature, right?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q All right. What is your understanding of</p> <p>4 sensitive?</p> <p>5 A Well, specific means nailing it down to a</p> <p>6 single -- make it simplistic. Specific means you</p> <p>7 nail it down to one cause or something clearly</p> <p>8 definable, whereas, sensitivity means it's the</p> <p>9 abnormal, but there could be a bunch of causes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And so -- excuse me. Please finish.</p> <p>11 A That's fine.</p> <p>12 Q So if something is a non-specific finding --</p> <p>13 and here we're talking about DLCO, you said a little</p> <p>14 while ago that there are other things that can cause</p> <p>15 a reduction in DLCO besides asbestos-related disease,</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 A That's true.</p> <p>18 Q That would be smoking, for example?</p> <p>19 A Smoking is a minimal. I mean, that's so</p> <p>20 overblown it's unbelievable. In the literature,</p> <p>21 current smokers may be down, particularly in</p> <p>22 Australia literature, a small amount in their DLCO,</p> <p>23 but not to a significant degree.</p> <p>24 Two things that make the difference is</p> <p>25 obstructive disease with ventilation-protrusion</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 A You mean other than smoking --</p> <p>2 Q Other than smoking.</p> <p>3 A -- and emphysema?</p> <p>4 Chronic asthma can be for many, many years.</p> <p>5 If you have asthma that's never been treated, it</p> <p>6 could result in chronic obstructive disease. There's</p> <p>7 also a fair number of much less common diseases that</p> <p>8 can do it such as bronchiectasis and some pulmonary</p> <p>9 vascular diseases can do it.</p> <p>10 Potentially if you have enough lung</p> <p>11 obstruction, you can get overexpansion and enough</p> <p>12 lung resection from surgery, you can get a little</p> <p>13 overexpansion and cause it, but for the most part,</p> <p>14 it's either emphysema, chronic asthma, or asbestos.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Could you turn to Page 705?</p> <p>16 A 700 and what?</p> <p>17 Q 705 --</p> <p>18 A 705.</p> <p>19 Q -- of the 2004 ATS.</p> <p>20 A (Complies.)</p> <p>21 Q The carryover paragraph -- the bottom of the</p> <p>22 first column carrying over says, Although pleural</p> <p>23 plaques has long been considered inconsequential</p> <p>24 markers of asbestos exposure, studies of large</p> <p>25 cohorts have shown a significant reduction in lung</p>

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 function attributable to the plaques averaging about 2 five percent of forced vital capacity even when 3 interstitial fibrosis asbestosis is absent 4 radiographically. 5 Do you see that? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Would you agree with me that a -- what 8 they're talking about here is a decline of five 9 percent as seen over a population of people, not the 10 decline of five percent in any individual? 11 A Oh, I'm sure, yeah, it's a large population 12 group. I don't know how big, but... (Pause.) 13 Q If a forced vital capacity declines by five 14 percent in an individual, that may or may not be 15 clinically significant, correct? 16 A Depends over what period of time. And you're 17 talking about five percent of predicted or five 18 percent of actual numbers? Because you lose a 19 certain percentage every year. 20 Q Well, I'm just talking about the literature 21 cited by the ATS statement. 22 Do you know whether the five percent they're 23 talking about is five percent of predicted or five 24 percent over a longitudinal period of time? 25 A I do not know the answer to that. I'm not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 Q Would you agree with me that if you have 2 pathologic specimens of someone's lungs, you can 3 definitely determine whether or not they have a 4 non-malignant asbestos-related disease or not? 5 A No, you can't. 6 Q You cannot? 7 A No, because frequently you cannot find the 8 asbestos fibers except for in very sophisticated 9 techniques in the lung, and so many of the pathologic 10 specimens in people known to have asbestosis do not 11 turn up asbestos bodies or asbestos fibers. 12 Q Have you ever heard pathology described as 13 the gold standard for determining whether or not 14 somebody has interstitial fibrosis? 15 A I haven't heard that. I'm not sure I'd agree 16 with it either. 17 Q Okay. So you would -- you would dispute the 18 idea that pathology would be the best indicator as to 19 whether or not someone has an asbestos-related 20 non-malignant disease? 21 A I think the best indicators are what we do 22 day in and day out. We take an environmental 23 history, we look at the x-rays, listen to the 24 patient's chest, we look at the pulmonary functions, 25 and make that decision, and I think we're probably</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 familiar with those articles. 2 Q Okay. At the bottom of that paragraph, the 3 ATS writes, Even so, most people with pleural plaques 4 alone have well-preserved lung functions, and they 5 cite to a study. 6 Do you agree with that? 7 A I don't have any problem with that. 8 Q Do you agree with me that the medical 9 literature as it relates to asbestos-related diseases 10 is quite extensive? 11 A It's voluminous. 12 Q And do you agree with me that equally 13 qualified doctors can read the same literature and 14 come to differing views about asbestos-related 15 medical issues? 16 A Certainly. 17 Q Are you familiar with the debate in the 18 medical literature about whether you can attribute 19 lung cancer to asbestos exposure in the absence of 20 underlying asbestosis? 21 A I've seen that. I don't know that I have an 22 opinion about it. 23 Q Okay. You are -- you're familiar with the 24 concept of pathology, right? 25 A Certainly.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 right almost all the time. 2 Q Okay. So is it fair to say that you do not 3 rely on pathology for your opinions about the 4 severity or the distinctness of pleural disease 5 caused by exposure to Libby asbestos as compared to 6 pleural disease caused by other asbestos? 7 A No, except that I have seen some things on 8 thoracoscopy photographs on the lungs which I have in 9 my collection of photographs from a surgeon that I 10 worked with in Spokane that demonstrates some things 11 that are unusual and look different, but they aren't 12 documented beyond that point, but... (Pause.) 13 (Mr. Stansbury exits.) 14 Q (By Mr. Finch) Who was the surgeon you used 15 to work with in Spokane? 16 A Vern Holbert*. 17 Q Would you agree with me that from the 18 perspective of pathology, there is no difference 19 between pleural disease caused by exposure to Libby 20 asbestos and pleural disease caused by anything else? 21 A I think there may be, but I can't tell you 22 for certain. We see a lot more inflammatory disease. 23 We see plaques that are scarlet red, very highly 24 inflamed, which correlates with a high degree of 25 chest pain and pleurisy in the people from Libby, and</p>

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 we see that when we look at the photographs and it's</p> <p>2 described by the surgeon that I'm referring to, who</p> <p>3 actually I've known for many, many years because I</p> <p>4 practiced in Spokane.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. But you haven't taken pathology from</p> <p>6 people who died of -- according to you, died as a</p> <p>7 result of pleural disease caused by exposure to Libby</p> <p>8 asbestos and compared that to pathology taken from</p> <p>9 people who have pleural disease caused by other types</p> <p>10 of asbestos exposure?</p> <p>11 A No, although those specimens are being</p> <p>12 collected.</p> <p>13 Q But you haven't -- in any of your academic</p> <p>14 writings or in any of your reports, you have not made</p> <p>15 any kind of comparison of pathology between the</p> <p>16 asbestos disease caused by exposure to Libby asbestos</p> <p>17 and asbestos disease caused by exposure to anything</p> <p>18 else?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. So you can't say that there's anything</p> <p>21 that is distinct or different about asbestos disease</p> <p>22 caused by exposure to Libby asbestos as compared to</p> <p>23 asbestos disease caused by exposure to some other</p> <p>24 type of asbestos from the perspective of a</p> <p>25 pathologist relying on pathological evidence?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 study to be valid, you have to define the cohort</p> <p>2 upfront and follow them over time to see how --</p> <p>3 whatever it is you're trying to determine has an</p> <p>4 affect on them has an impact?</p> <p>5 A It can.</p> <p>6 Q You're familiar with the Selikoff study of</p> <p>7 the insulators that was done by Mount Sinai, correct?</p> <p>8 A I am.</p> <p>9 Q That's an example of a cohort study?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Would you agree with me that your -- the</p> <p>12 people described in your 2004 paper, that's not a</p> <p>13 cohort study?</p> <p>14 A No, I think in a sense it is because of the</p> <p>15 way it was selected. It was selected as every</p> <p>16 patient that came into my office that had an asbestos</p> <p>17 disease, had zero pulmonary function studies every</p> <p>18 year, and so looking at that cohort, I just looked at</p> <p>19 everybody that had had two pulmonary function studies</p> <p>20 over a period, and as it turned out, it was over a</p> <p>21 period of a number of years, but -- so that's a</p> <p>22 cohort.</p> <p>23 Q Well, it wasn't defined -- you didn't start</p> <p>24 out the way Selikoff did, with defining the cohort</p> <p>25 people who were exposed to asbestos and then</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 A Probably not, but I don't have enough</p> <p>2 evidence to say one way or the other at this point.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Have you read Dr. Sam Hammer's report</p> <p>4 in this case?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q His opinion is based on the work that he's</p> <p>7 done, there's no difference from the pathology</p> <p>8 between asbestos disease seen in Libby patients and</p> <p>9 asbestos disease seen elsewhere?</p> <p>10 A I believe that's his opinion, yes.</p> <p>11 Q And you're not in a position to dispute that?</p> <p>12 A No. I have a high regard for Sam Hammer.</p> <p>13 (Mr. Stansbury returns.)</p> <p>14 Q (By Mr. Finch) Do you have an understanding</p> <p>15 of the term used in epidemiology called a cohort</p> <p>16 study?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And what's your understanding of a cohort</p> <p>19 study?</p> <p>20 A Well, a cohort study is a group of people</p> <p>21 that have something that you want to study and you</p> <p>22 put together in that cohort, either with or without</p> <p>23 controls, the nature of whatever it is you're</p> <p>24 studying and detailing it and outlining it.</p> <p>25 Q So would you agree with me that for a cohort</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 following them over time, correct?</p> <p>2 A These were already people that I knew had</p> <p>3 asbestos abnormality on their x-rays and had the</p> <p>4 exposure history on them.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. So the selection criteria wasn't --</p> <p>6 wasn't controlled by a level of exposure. It was</p> <p>7 just people who happened to have two or more</p> <p>8 pulmonary function tests?</p> <p>9 A Basically that was it. It was a very simple</p> <p>10 study.</p> <p>11 Q What did -- strike that.</p> <p>12 In your expert witness report, you described</p> <p>13 some of the medical literature about the differences</p> <p>14 between chrysotile asbestos and other amphiboles</p> <p>15 asbestos being productive of mesothelioma or lung</p> <p>16 cancer. Do you recall that section of your report?</p> <p>17 A Repeat, please, so I'm sure --</p> <p>18 Q In your report -- in your report, you have a</p> <p>19 section where you describe what your view of the</p> <p>20 medical literature is about whether or not chrysotile</p> <p>21 asbestos is more or less likely to cause mesothelioma</p> <p>22 or lung cancer than amphiboles asbestos?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Did you read Dr. Frank's testimony in his</p> <p>25 deposition last week or two weeks ago --</p>

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 A I did.</p> <p>2 Q -- on that point?</p> <p>3 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>4 Q Did you have any understanding that the</p> <p>5 Berman and Crump* work that you refer to at</p> <p>6 paragraph 57 of your report was reviewed by an EPA</p> <p>7 science advisory board this past summer of 2008?</p> <p>8 A I was not aware of that.</p> <p>9 Q Dr. Frank was aware of it, correct?</p> <p>10 A Yeah, no, I do understand he was.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And his -- he agreed with the EPA</p> <p>12 Science Advisory Board that the Berman and Crump work</p> <p>13 that attempted to quantify the differences between</p> <p>14 fiber type in causing mesothelioma or lung cancer was</p> <p>15 weak?</p> <p>16 A He didn't dismiss it. He said that the</p> <p>17 school was still out on it basically in his -- in his</p> <p>18 deposition.</p> <p>19 Q Right.</p> <p>20 And the EPA Science Advisory Board determined</p> <p>21 the scientific basis that is laid out on in the</p> <p>22 technical document -- and they're referring to the</p> <p>23 Berman and Crump work -- in support of their method</p> <p>24 to attempt to quantify the difference between fiber</p> <p>25 types is weak and inadequate. That was his</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 court.</p> <p>2 Would you agree that 9,500 is a good</p> <p>3 approximation of the people in Lincoln County,</p> <p>4 Montana, who were likely exposed to Grace asbestos?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q What would be your figure for that?</p> <p>7 A I have absolutely no idea. There were</p> <p>8 hundreds and hundreds of people that worked in the</p> <p>9 Libby dam that lived there for a couple years. There</p> <p>10 was a lot of construction going on at that point in</p> <p>11 time. There was a very transient population that</p> <p>12 came in and out at that point. There could be in the</p> <p>13 thousands. I just don't know the answer to that.</p> <p>14 There's also a vacationing spot there.</p> <p>15 There's been a lot of people that would spend summers</p> <p>16 up there that are not included in that population, so</p> <p>17 the actual number of exposed people is probably a lot</p> <p>18 higher but are not included in any of Grace's figures</p> <p>19 because they excluded anybody that wasn't a permanent</p> <p>20 resident.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. So I think I pulled that figure out of</p> <p>22 your report.</p> <p>23 Would you agree with me that at least 9,500</p> <p>24 people were exposed to Libby asbestos?</p> <p>25 A Oh, I assume that that's probably -- you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 understanding of what the EPA Science Advisory Board</p> <p>2 determined, correct?</p> <p>3 A Correct.</p> <p>4 Q And I take it you weren't asked to</p> <p>5 participate in that science advisory board review of</p> <p>6 differences between fiber types, correct?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q And you would agree with me that it's still</p> <p>9 the official position of the United States government</p> <p>10 that chrysotile is equally likely to cause</p> <p>11 mesothelioma as amphibole asbestos?</p> <p>12 A I don't think it says exactly that. It says</p> <p>13 that the information -- that the data was weak. It</p> <p>14 doesn't say that it is not. It just says the school</p> <p>15 is still out on it, that Arthur's -- Dr. Frank's</p> <p>16 comments on that reflected that.</p> <p>17 MR. FINCH: Let's mark this as the next</p> <p>18 exhibit.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit-6 marked for</p> <p>20 identification.)</p> <p>21 Q (By Mr. Finch) Dr. Whitehouse, this is an</p> <p>22 exhibit I used with Dr. Frank. I put it together</p> <p>23 from a combination of either statements in your</p> <p>24 expert witness report or statements that the Libby</p> <p>25 claimants' lawyers have made in papers filed with the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 know, I don't think we really know for sure. I know</p> <p>2 that -- that it's probably more than that, but on the</p> <p>3 other hand, I don't know whether the people that</p> <p>4 lived up in the far extremes of the county were ever</p> <p>5 exposed to it as far as I know. It's a big county.</p> <p>6 Q And then the ATSDR came in and did some</p> <p>7 screening a few years ago for -- to determine what --</p> <p>8 how many people had x-ray abnormalities as a result</p> <p>9 of exposure to asbestos, right?</p> <p>10 A And that was a -- they studied 6,000 and</p> <p>11 there was a significant number that were never looked</p> <p>12 at, and of those 6,000, there were a fair number of</p> <p>13 people that were not Lincoln County residents. They</p> <p>14 were people from Spokane that used to live there or</p> <p>15 from other parts of Montana, and I forget the exact</p> <p>16 number that had abnormal x-rays. I think it was 19</p> <p>17 percent or 17 percent, so it was about 1,000 or more.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. Could you turn to Page 30 in your</p> <p>19 expert report?</p> <p>20 A Sure. Page 30?</p> <p>21 Q Page 30. It's Page 30. It's -- I think it's</p> <p>22 paragraph 35. Paragraph 35 runs on for several</p> <p>23 pages. It's Page 30.</p> <p>24 A Okay.</p> <p>25 Q See at the top of the page, the Peipins, it</p>

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 talks about the 9,500 people --</p> <p>2 A Right.</p> <p>3 Q -- from Central Lincoln County?</p> <p>4 So I take it that all of your opinions about</p> <p>5 pleural disease caused by exposure to Libby asbestos</p> <p>6 are valid only for the people who have</p> <p>7 asbestos-related disease, and you're not making any</p> <p>8 conclusions or analyses about the entire cohort</p> <p>9 people who were exposed to Libby asbestos; is that</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 A Well, not really. I guess the best way to</p> <p>12 say that is that I'm sure that there are a fair</p> <p>13 number of people out there still that have not been</p> <p>14 discovered and may have abnormalities on their films,</p> <p>15 but I'm not drawing any conclusions about that</p> <p>16 because I haven't had a chance to study them.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. So you're only drawing conclusions</p> <p>18 about -- your conclusions are only valid with respect</p> <p>19 to people who have already been diagnosed with</p> <p>20 asbestos-related disease; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q All right. And then the second page of this,</p> <p>23 there's --</p> <p>24 MR. LEWIS: Second page of what,</p> <p>25 Counsel?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that your</p> <p>2 opinions about someone who has been diagnosed with an</p> <p>3 asbestos-related non-malignant disease as a result of</p> <p>4 being exposed to Libby asbestos, that that person</p> <p>5 would have a probability of death are based on the</p> <p>6 CARD mortality study?</p> <p>7 A I'm only going to base that on the ones that</p> <p>8 I know more about which is the Libby claimants, the</p> <p>9 950 there. I would point out one other point in this</p> <p>10 is that there's 1,800 clinic patients with a</p> <p>11 diagnosis. There's also another three or four</p> <p>12 hundred that have been screened and do not have</p> <p>13 disease.</p> <p>14 Q Do not have disease?</p> <p>15 A Do not have disease, but they're also part of</p> <p>16 the clinic.</p> <p>17 Q But there's -- there's 1,800 people that are</p> <p>18 part of the clinic and there's 950 of them that are</p> <p>19 Libby claimants and you have more familiarity with</p> <p>20 that group than the 850 diseased patients that you</p> <p>21 see, but aren't the Libby claimants, correct?</p> <p>22 A That's true and particularly since there's</p> <p>23 been a lot added in the last year or so and I've been</p> <p>24 working less up there.</p> <p>25 Q And I believe I asked you this this morning,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 MR. FINCH: Second page of Whitehouse</p> <p>2 Exhibit-6.</p> <p>3 Q (By Mr. Finch) You have stated in your</p> <p>4 report and elsewhere that there's approximately 1,800</p> <p>5 CARD Clinic patients with asbestos-related disease?</p> <p>6 A Yeah, that's the number that I got from</p> <p>7 the -- you know, the nurses that run the place about</p> <p>8 six months ago. They didn't have an exact number.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Would you expect that those 1,800 are</p> <p>10 largely overlapped with -- whether the exposed</p> <p>11 population was 9,500 or 6,600 or 10,000, that the</p> <p>12 1,800 or the substantial majority of those people are</p> <p>13 a subset of the exposed population?</p> <p>14 A I would think so, but there's a certain</p> <p>15 number of them that are not part of that Lincoln</p> <p>16 County population, above, anymore. They were at one</p> <p>17 time, but they're not now. They live -- there's a</p> <p>18 lot of patients in Spokane, in Missoula, in</p> <p>19 Kalispell, and some in Great Falls, and then we get</p> <p>20 patients all over the country coming back that used</p> <p>21 to live there, so -- and I don't know the breakdown</p> <p>22 in numbers. I have no idea what it is.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Could you go to the last page about</p> <p>24 this -- last page of Whitehouse Exhibit-6?</p> <p>25 A Okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 but you haven't done anything to compare and contrast</p> <p>2 either the type of disease or the severity of the</p> <p>3 disease between the 850 other patients and the 950</p> <p>4 who are Libby claimants, correct?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q You haven't -- you have not done that,</p> <p>7 correct?</p> <p>8 A No, I have not.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And is it correct that you hold the</p> <p>10 opinion that someone who is diagnosed with a</p> <p>11 non-malignant asbestos disease caused by exposure to</p> <p>12 Libby asbestos is more likely than not going to die</p> <p>13 from an asbestos-related disease?</p> <p>14 A Out of that 950?</p> <p>15 Q Out of the 950 or the 1,800?</p> <p>16 A Will you read -- repeat the question again.</p> <p>17 Q Sure.</p> <p>18 A I want to make sure I get it right.</p> <p>19 Q Do you have an opinion -- do you have an</p> <p>20 opinion to a reasonable degree of medical certainty</p> <p>21 that for the 950 Libby claimants who have been</p> <p>22 diagnosed with a non-malignant asbestos-related</p> <p>23 disease, that each one of them is more likely than</p> <p>24 not going to die from an asbestos-related disease?</p> <p>25 A The death rate, when we've gone through the</p>

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 death certificates in all of these people, it's 2 something like 57 percent -- or I think it was 52 3 percent on best information, 57 percent was 4 significant association with asbestos disease -- I 5 think that group of people has the same breakdown in 6 percentages as the 950 -- approximately a third 7 miners, and the balance are community members and 8 family members. Community members are the 9 majority -- I think you can make the extrapolation 10 having looked at those people myself, that most of 11 the people that died are my patients, looking at 12 those, then we're going to see the same thing in the 13 950 and so that there is a high probability or not a 14 high probability, there's probability that they're 15 going to die more than 50 percent from asbestos 16 disease. 17 Q Okay. What about related -- 18 A And then add to that the cancers on top of 19 it. 20 Q What about the 850? The 850 on this that 21 aren't -- 22 A The 850? 23 Q Yeah. 24 A I'm not going to draw any conclusions. I 25 don't know anything about them.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 thickness, the non-malignant ones, the pleural 2 thickness, the blunting plaques, et cetera. We did 3 it independently. 4 (Ms. Bloom returns.) 5 Q (By Mr. Finch) Okay. Let me see if I 6 understand this. You started out with 227 people who 7 were CARD Clinic patients -- 8 A Yes. 9 Q -- that had died, right? 10 A Died through last year. 11 Q Through last year. 12 And this is the mortality study that you're 13 relying on for your opinion as to probability of 14 death, correct? 15 A That's right. 16 Q All right. Then you excluded 41 of them for 17 various reasons, correct? 18 A Well, basically, they either didn't have any 19 asbestos diagnosis to begin with, we didn't have a 20 death certificate, couldn't get one, didn't have a 21 chart, didn't get chest x-rays. There's a lot of 22 reasons why, but unless we had a fairly complete set 23 of data, we didn't -- they weren't included. 24 Q Okay. And that left you with 186 people? 25 A Right.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 MR. FINCH: Okay. This would be a good 2 time to take another break. 3 THE WITNESS: Okay. 4 MR. FINCH: I just want one for 5 personal reasons. Why don't we come back in five 6 minutes? 7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the 8 record. The time now is 10:30 a.m. This is the end 9 of disk number one in the continuing deposition. 10 (Recess.) 11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the 12 record. The time is now 10:37 a.m. This is the 13 beginning of disk number two in the continuing 14 deposition of Dr. Alan Whitehouse. 15 (Exhibit-7 marked for 16 identification.) 17 EXAMINATION (Continuing) 18 BY MR. FINCH: 19 Q Dr. Whitehouse, I've put what's been marked 20 as Whitehouse Exhibit-7 in front of you. 21 A Yes. 22 Q What is that document? 23 A Oh, that's a -- that's a counting sheet that 24 was done basically on the basis of Dr. Frank's and my 25 reading all these x-rays and these people for pleural</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 Q And then of that, 34 of them died of 2 mesothelioma or some other asbestos-related type 3 cancer, right? 4 A Mm-hm, yes. 5 Q And then you got 76 that were nos and 76 that 6 were yeses, right? 7 A Yes, exactly the same number. Sort of odd. 8 (Mr. Longosz returns from recess.) 9 Q (By Mr. Finch) What is it -- what is it -- 10 who determined what versus a yes or a no? That was 11 you? 12 A And Dr. Frank. 13 Q Well, he testified that he looked at the 14 x-rays on the 76, but that you made the determination 15 as to whether or not -- 16 A Well -- 17 Q -- there was a -- the death was due to an 18 asbestos-related disease? 19 A Yeah, actually -- 20 MR. LEWIS: Just a -- just a second. 21 Object to that on the grounds it's not put in a form 22 of a question and it's just a comment on Dr. Frank's 23 testimony and should be stricken from the record. 24 MR. FINCH: Let me rephrase the 25 question.</p>

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 Q (By Mr. Finch) How did you determine that 2 someone was a yes versus a no? 3 A Dr. Frank actually did not do that part. I 4 did that part of it. I misspoke. Basically what I 5 did was I -- we looked at the death certificates or I 6 looked at the death certificates. I looked at the 7 chart, the x-rays, and made basically a decision 8 based on all that information put together and some 9 of my -- made a decision that it was probably a 10 contributing cause and others which it was a direct 11 cause, so you'll note that there was actually 12 different percentages for the direct cause versus the 13 contributing cause. 14 I had the advantage of the fact that I knew 15 almost all of these patients within -- with just the 16 exception of a few because I had seen so many of them 17 over the years previously. That's how it came about. 18 Q Okay. And what standard did you use to 19 determine whether or not someone died as a result of 20 a non-malignant asbestos-related disease? Did you 21 use a substantial contributing cause standard or did 22 you use some other standard? 23 A I used the best available information, sort 24 of an approach similar to what Selikoff did, tried to 25 reduplicate his studies with the insulators and I --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 A We didn't use the contributing cause in the 2 final numbers, okay, because that's always subject to 3 a lot of discretion. What we did or what I did 4 basically was to make certain that their death was 5 directly caused in some form or another by their 6 asbestosis. That means that having looked at their 7 x-ray and their pulmonary functions and all their 8 charting, that they had severe disease, and then they 9 had to have some sort of a terminal event in which 10 either the asbestosis killed them because they became 11 a little bit more disabled or because of the fact 12 that it led to another problem that killed them such 13 as a pneumonia or severe cor pulmonale resulting from 14 pulmonary hypertension, things like that. 15 Q Okay. 16 A And that's how the decisions were made. 17 Q Okay. Attached to your report and, 18 unfortunately, it doesn't have a page on it, but it's 19 kind of near the back, there's something that is 20 entitled 116 Mortality List.xls. 21 A Let's see what number it is. 22 Q It's -- 23 A Where is it? 24 Q In my copy of the report, it was -- it was 25 before your references. It wasn't in an exhibit to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 a lot of them were obvious. They were asbestos 2 deaths. They were signed out, their death 3 certificate, as asbestosis. 4 There was a fair number in which they would 5 say a terminal pneumonia, but they had severe 6 asbestosis and that was considered an asbestos death, 7 and there were a number in which they called COPD and 8 they really didn't have COPD. 9 This, unfortunately, is one of the problems 10 with death certificates is that family docs not only 11 in Montana, but in Spokane and everywhere else call 12 everything COPD that dies of respiratory disease, and 13 that's where you have to fare it out and look at all 14 the data before you can make that judgment because it 15 was asbestos related. 16 Q And when you were making the judgment as to 17 whether or not it was asbestos related, how did -- 18 what standard were you using to do that? Were you 19 saying it's only asbestos related if I conclude to a 20 reasonable degree of medical certainty that the 21 asbestos-related disease was the cause of the death 22 or did you also say that a death of asbestos disease 23 related if you concluded to a reasonable degree of 24 medical certainty that the asbestos disease 25 contributed to the death?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 your report. It was just -- 2 A Is that it? 3 MR. LEWIS: Is this it? 4 A 116 Mortality List? 5 Q (By Mr. Finch) Yes. 6 A Excel? 7 Q Yeah. 8 What is that? What is that document, 9 Dr. Whitehouse? 10 A Well, that document is the -- first off, the 11 names of the people that are clients, plus the 12 initials of people that are not clients. It gives a 13 diagnosis date, whether it was on the death 14 certificate they died or whether it was best evidence 15 that caused it, who signed the death certificate, 16 where they lived, things like that. 17 Q Okay. And it's -- 18 A And it's basically the demographics of 19 everybody. 20 Q Okay. This is the demographics of the people 21 involved in the mortality study; is that correct? 22 A Yeah, that's right. And if you'll note that 23 a lot of them, even though I didn't sign most of the 24 death certificates because a lot of them died in 25 Libby, I had seen them in enough proximity that I</p>

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 knew -- had seem them in Spokane and taken care of 2 them in Spokane, so I frequently did not sign the 3 death certificates myself. 4 Q Okay. Let me just -- let me just understand 5 what this is. 6 This is 116 people -- 7 A Right. 8 Q -- that you determined their -- that their 9 death was due to an asbestos-related disease; is that 10 right? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And this would include both the cancers and 13 the non-cancers, right? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Okay. Why the discrepancy between the 116 16 shown here and if you add 76 and 34, you come up with 17 110? 18 MR. BERNICK: It's because you can't 19 add, Nate. Let the record reflect that was in gest. 20 MR. LEWIS: Perhaps it's my 21 shortcoming, Counsel, but I don't understand the 22 question. I don't -- 23 Q (By Mr. Finch) My question is -- my question 24 is: Is there -- are there six people on this 25 document, 116 Mortality List.xls that either didn't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 Q And sub means somebody who was a 2 subcontractor that worked at the mines? 3 A Yeah. 4 Q And then FM means family member? 5 A Yeah. 6 Q Are you familiar with the medical literature 7 that exists that shows that females or other family 8 members of workers who were occupationally exposed to 9 asbestos can be exposed to substantial amounts of 10 asbestos in the home? 11 A Oh, sure. 12 Q Would you agree with me that generally 13 speaking of the people in Libby, the people that 14 worked at the mine were exposed to significantly more 15 asbestos than the community exposures? 16 A In certain parts of the mine, almost 17 certainly. 18 Q And would you also agree with me that the 19 family members of people who were occupationally 20 exposed to Grace's asbestos in and around Libby 21 probably had higher exposures on average than people 22 who just had pure community exposures? 23 A That is undetermined. It probably is true, 24 but it's undetermined. 25 Q Okay. And then C, I take it, stands for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 die as a result of asbestos-related disease or 2 there's a miscounting or what? 3 A Those were the six that we took off to get 4 final numbers. 5 Q Okay. All right. 6 A Okay? 7 Q I understand that now. 8 So this would be the -- 9 A These are the ones that, originally, I 10 thought were and then -- 11 Q And then you took off six? 12 A Well, and then Arthur gave me some static 13 about a couple of them and we -- because he had 14 looked at a lot of these as well and then we narrowed 15 it down by, you know, going through it a second time 16 to come out. 17 The problem was that the first time I did 18 this was contributing cause and the second time I did 19 it was more directly as the direct best estimate of 20 underlying disease that was the causing factor. 21 Q Okay. Now, let me make sure I understand the 22 categories. 23 Worker W means somebody who worked for W.R. 24 Grace? 25 A That was a miner, mm-hm.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 community exposure? 2 A Right. 3 Q And what is C or FM? Is that just where you 4 didn't know or couldn't tell? 5 A Sometimes you couldn't tell. 6 Q Okay. Going back to the counting sheet which 7 is Exhibit-7. 8 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 9 Q For the lung function tests, I take it these 10 are all related to the 76 who had non-malignant 11 diseases, correct? 12 A Yeah. 13 Q And you mention in your answer -- some of 14 your answers a little while ago, you were talking 15 about people of the 76 who had died as a result of 16 asbestosis. Do you recall that? 17 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 18 Q How many of them died as a result of 19 asbestosis versus died as a result of pleural 20 disease? 21 A We -- you know, basically there were less 22 than a third that had -- even had interstitial 23 disease when you looked at the x-rays. They may have 24 had some interstitial disease on CT, but the majority 25 of them had pleural disease.</p>

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 We finally came to the conclusion that when</p> <p>2 you excluded some of the ones that had it on CT, that</p> <p>3 probably eight of them and as many as eleven or</p> <p>4 twelve died of pure pleural disease. It's hard to</p> <p>5 determine for sure.</p> <p>6 And some of them we didn't have CT scans on,</p> <p>7 and so you really didn't know for sure whether</p> <p>8 there's underlying disease that you didn't see in the</p> <p>9 scans, but only a third of them had interstitial</p> <p>10 disease on their plain films, so... (Pause.)</p> <p>11 Q Okay. So a third of them had interstitial</p> <p>12 disease on x-ray; is that right?</p> <p>13 A Yeah, and it was all 1/1 -- 1/0 or less.</p> <p>14 Q And what about -- what -- in addition to that</p> <p>15 third, were there any that had interstitial disease</p> <p>16 that was visible on HRCT, but not visible on x-ray?</p> <p>17 A Of that third?</p> <p>18 Q No, of the whole 176 people.</p> <p>19 A Oh, yeah, there were more that had it on CT</p> <p>20 scan that we did not see on the plain films, yes.</p> <p>21 Q So those people had interstitial disease too?</p> <p>22 A Yeah, they had minimal interstitial disease,</p> <p>23 but, yes, they did.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So if it was -- if your test was, does</p> <p>25 someone have interstitial disease observable by x-ray</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 A -- pure pleural, minimal IF? Okay.</p> <p>2 Q And IF stands for interstitial fibrosis?</p> <p>3 A Yeah.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. Now, back to the first page of</p> <p>5 Exhibit-7. That is lung function tests. Am I</p> <p>6 correct that of the 76 that died, 53 percent of them</p> <p>7 had a reduction of either FVC or TLC below 65 percent</p> <p>8 of predicted?</p> <p>9 A Repeat that.</p> <p>10 Q Yeah. You say -- what the document says is</p> <p>11 29 have only DLCO, less than 65.</p> <p>12 A Right.</p> <p>13 Q 29 of 61 have only DLCO, less than 65.</p> <p>14 A Right.</p> <p>15 Q My question is: Is the flip of that true,</p> <p>16 i.e., do 32 out of the 61 have either forced vital</p> <p>17 capacity or total lung capacity less than 65 percent?</p> <p>18 A Well, we know we have 28 listed here and 12</p> <p>19 with TLC. That's 40. I'm not sure that I can answer</p> <p>20 your question on the basis of that.</p> <p>21 Q Are you finished with your answer?</p> <p>22 A Yeah.</p> <p>23 Q Okay.</p> <p>24 A Oh, I was waiting for you.</p> <p>25 Q No, I thought you -- I thought you were still</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 or CT scan, is it correct that a majority of the</p> <p>2 people in the 76 -- the group of 76 had interstitial</p> <p>3 disease?</p> <p>4 A First off, you have to define what is</p> <p>5 significant in interstitial disease because according</p> <p>6 to the ILO or the ATS standards, a 1/0 or 0/1 doesn't</p> <p>7 count as an independent diagnosis, and we're counting</p> <p>8 a lot of those for 0/1s or 1/0s, so what absolute --</p> <p>9 the actual number that had significant interstitial</p> <p>10 disease, I think it's in here somewhere.</p> <p>11 Q In the counting sheet, you're looking at</p> <p>12 Exhibit-7, Dr. Whitehouse?</p> <p>13 A Yes. I'm trying to remember where it is.</p> <p>14 Thirteen --</p> <p>15 Q What page?</p> <p>16 A -- another nine that had moderate.</p> <p>17 Q What page are you looking at?</p> <p>18 A At the second page, the back of the second</p> <p>19 page, the top of the thing.</p> <p>20 Q Does it say Page 2 of 6 at the bottom there?</p> <p>21 A Page 4 of 6.</p> <p>22 Q Page 4 of 6?</p> <p>23 A At the top. See at the top where it says</p> <p>24 group --</p> <p>25 Q Got it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 looking at the document and was going to add</p> <p>2 something. Sorry about that.</p> <p>3 One of your -- in addition to the blunting</p> <p>4 requirement, one of your major criticisms of the TDP</p> <p>5 criteria for severe pleural disease is that -- and</p> <p>6 for that and the other non-malignant diseases, it</p> <p>7 doesn't allow for reduction of DLCO as a basis for</p> <p>8 qualifying for the compensation, correct?</p> <p>9 A That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q You would agree with me to the extent that is</p> <p>11 unfair or unequal or improper, whatever in fairness</p> <p>12 about that exists, would equally apply to people who</p> <p>13 were exposed to Grace asbestos outside of Libby as in</p> <p>14 Libby?</p> <p>15 A You know, I don't know enough about any of</p> <p>16 the exposures of the people that were exposed outside</p> <p>17 of Libby to really draw any decent conclusions on it,</p> <p>18 you know. I mean, I understand Libby quite well and</p> <p>19 I understand chrysotile and the forms that I've seen</p> <p>20 it, but I'm not sure that I can tell you about it.</p> <p>21 I would suspect that it's probably similar,</p> <p>22 but I don't know for sure.</p> <p>23 MR. FINCH: All right. I am just about</p> <p>24 done. What I'm going to do is mark very quickly a</p> <p>25 set of references from the medical literature that</p>

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 I -- that you cite in your various parts of the</p> <p>2 report. I'm not going to ask you any questions about</p> <p>3 them. I just want to make sure I've got the right</p> <p>4 documents to make sure I know exactly what you're</p> <p>5 citing, so if we take a two-minute break off the</p> <p>6 record, I can get my colleague to mark all these and</p> <p>7 then we can just hand them to you and I can just go</p> <p>8 through them in probably five minutes or so.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Sure.</p> <p>10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the</p> <p>11 record. The time is now 10:56 a.m.</p> <p>12 (Exhibit-8 through Exhibit-14</p> <p>13 marked for identification.)</p> <p>14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the</p> <p>15 record. The time is now 11:01 a.m.</p> <p>16 Q (By Mr. Finch) Dr. Whitehouse, do you have</p> <p>17 Whitehouse Exhibit-8 in front of you?</p> <p>18 A Have what?</p> <p>19 Q Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-8 in front of</p> <p>20 you?</p> <p>21 MR. LEWIS: This one.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Oh, this one.</p> <p>23 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>24 MR. LEWIS: Can you just identify it</p> <p>25 for the record, please?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 A Yeah, mm-hm.</p> <p>2 Q The next exhibit, Exhibit-11 --</p> <p>3 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>4 Q -- is titled -- it's from the Journal of</p> <p>5 Occupational Medicine and Toxicology?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q It's a paper by Susan Miles?</p> <p>8 A Yeah, it's quoted in the article, I think, as</p> <p>9 Yates.</p> <p>10 Q It's, Clinical Consequences of</p> <p>11 Asbestos-Related Diffuse Pleural Thickening: A</p> <p>12 Review. Is this something that you cited and relied</p> <p>13 on in one of your reports?</p> <p>14 A Correct.</p> <p>15 Q What is Whitehouse Deposition Exhibit-12?</p> <p>16 A Lung Function Testing: Selection of</p> <p>17 Reference Values.</p> <p>18 Q This is an American Thoracic Society</p> <p>19 statement, correct?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q This is something you cite and rely on in</p> <p>22 your expert report?</p> <p>23 A In part, yes.</p> <p>24 Q Whitehouse-13 is something -- is an article</p> <p>25 entitled, Asbestos-Induced Pleural Fibrosis and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 MR. FINCH: Yeah, this is the --</p> <p>2 Q (By Mr. Finch) Do you recognize this as</p> <p>3 the -- it's an article entitled, Changes in the</p> <p>4 Normal Maximal Expiratory Flow-Volume Curve with</p> <p>5 Growth and Aging. The first lead author is Knudson?</p> <p>6 A Yeah, this is the -- where the pulmonary</p> <p>7 norms come from.</p> <p>8 Q This is the pulmonary norms for spirometry</p> <p>9 that you use; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q The next exhibit, Whitehouse Exhibit-9, this</p> <p>12 is a paper by -- entitled, Radiographic ILO Readings</p> <p>13 Predict Arterial Oxygen Desaturation During Exercise</p> <p>14 in Subjects with Asbestos. This is a paper you cite</p> <p>15 in your report?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, I've seen that.</p> <p>17 Q Whitehouse Exhibit-10 is the excerpt from the</p> <p>18 AMA, Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment</p> <p>19 that contains sections about the respiratory system;</p> <p>20 is that right, Dr. Whitehouse?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you cite this in your expert report?</p> <p>23 A Yeah, I'm sure we did.</p> <p>24 Q By this, I mean Whitehouse Deposition</p> <p>25 Exhibit-10.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 Impaired Lung Function, David Schwartz, et cetera?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q That's a document that you cite and rely upon</p> <p>4 in your expert report?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Whitehouse-14 is an article -- 1992 article</p> <p>7 by Lilis Miller, et al., The Effect of</p> <p>8 Asbestos-Induced Pleural Fibrosis on Pulmonary</p> <p>9 Function: Quantitative Evaluation?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q That's an article you cite and rely on in</p> <p>12 your expert work in this case?</p> <p>13 A Although is this '91 or the '92 one?</p> <p>14 Q This is the '92 one. You cite both --</p> <p>15 A I cite both.</p> <p>16 Q -- but you rely on the '91 one -- I mean the</p> <p>17 '92 one as well, correct?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. FINCH: Okay. Let me look over my</p> <p>20 notes, but I think I'm done. So, off the record.</p> <p>21 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the</p> <p>22 record. The time is now 11:04 a.m.</p> <p>23 (Recess.)</p> <p>24 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the</p> <p>25 record. The time is now 11:18 a.m.</p>

27 (Pages 102 to 105)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 EXAMINATION</p> <p>2 BY MR. BERNICK:</p> <p>3 Q Good morning, Dr. Whitehouse. Last time I</p> <p>4 saw you was in the beautiful confines of Missoula,</p> <p>5 Montana.</p> <p>6 A In the beautiful courthouse, right.</p> <p>7 Q In the beautiful courthouse; that's right.</p> <p>8 So I'm going to be asking you some questions</p> <p>9 here this morning that are focused on the somewhat</p> <p>10 different context of this case.</p> <p>11 And let me just ask preliminary: I take it</p> <p>12 from your testimony that you've had occasion to</p> <p>13 review the deposition that was taken of Dr. Frank a</p> <p>14 few days ago; is that correct?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Is there any other testimony that you've</p> <p>17 reviewed in connection with your work in this case?</p> <p>18 A Testimony or reports or both?</p> <p>19 Q Just testimony.</p> <p>20 A Oh, I reviewed Dr. Welch's and Dr. Parker's.</p> <p>21 Q Okay.</p> <p>22 A And Dr. Moolgavkar's. I don't know how you</p> <p>23 pronounce that.</p> <p>24 Q Moolgavkar.</p> <p>25 A Oh, Moolgavkar, okay.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 A Jon Heberling, the attorney, thought it was a</p> <p>2 good idea if I reviewed them.</p> <p>3 Q Mr. Finch is reminding me that this is not a</p> <p>4 case of plaintiffs and defendants any more, so I</p> <p>5 shouldn't refer to defendants. He's grinning</p> <p>6 because --</p> <p>7 A Oh.</p> <p>8 Q -- he jumped at the opportunity to correct</p> <p>9 me, which I appreciate, of course.</p> <p>10 So to be clear --</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: We thought you guys -- we</p> <p>12 understand you guys are in a lockstep on all these</p> <p>13 issues.</p> <p>14 MR. BERNICK: Well, you'd be surprised.</p> <p>15 The most miserable, knock-down, drag-out fights you</p> <p>16 can possibly imagine. I go home and talk to my wife</p> <p>17 about how difficult it is for us to get along.</p> <p>18 Q (By Mr. Bernick) No, seriously,</p> <p>19 Mr. Heberling thought it would be a good idea if you</p> <p>20 reviewed the deposition testimony offered by the</p> <p>21 experts who are appearing for the plan proponents; is</p> <p>22 that right?</p> <p>23 A Yeah, he did and he provided me copies of</p> <p>24 them.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So -- but -- so did he make the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 Remind me who else you've done recently.</p> <p>2 Q Oh, I don't know. I've not really kept</p> <p>3 careful --</p> <p>4 A That may be all. I'm not sure.</p> <p>5 Q Did you review any of the testimony --</p> <p>6 A Orrig*, yeah, I did review that.</p> <p>7 Q You did review Orrig?</p> <p>8 A Yeah. Some of those, more detailed than</p> <p>9 others admittedly.</p> <p>10 Q Did you review any of the testimony that was</p> <p>11 offered at the trial, at the criminal trial?</p> <p>12 A Only my own.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Didn't review the testimony of</p> <p>14 Dr. Lockey* or --</p> <p>15 A No.</p> <p>16 Q -- Dr. Lemon*?</p> <p>17 A No.</p> <p>18 Q Whose idea was it to review the testimony --</p> <p>19 the deposition testimony of the defense experts that</p> <p>20 you mentioned?</p> <p>21 A Oh --</p> <p>22 MR. FINCH: Object to form.</p> <p>23 A -- I think Jon Heberling asked me and thought</p> <p>24 it was a good idea if I did.</p> <p>25 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Huh?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 selection of which transcripts you should read?</p> <p>2 A No, I think he just -- I think he's always</p> <p>3 given me everybody's transcripts for the most part,</p> <p>4 not all of them maybe, but anything that's happened</p> <p>5 in the last month or so, I think I've got copies of.</p> <p>6 Q Okay.</p> <p>7 A He keeps me pretty well informed.</p> <p>8 Q Whose idea was it for you to review the</p> <p>9 transcript of Dr. Frank's deposition?</p> <p>10 A That was mine actually.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And why did you decide to read</p> <p>12 Dr. Frank's deposition?</p> <p>13 A I know Dr. Frank pretty well, okay, and</p> <p>14 basically I wanted to see what he had to say. I</p> <p>15 don't think he said anything that I particularly</p> <p>16 disagreed with or modified anything I was going to</p> <p>17 say, but I -- I didn't know for sure that -- what he</p> <p>18 thought about some things and I wanted to be sure</p> <p>19 that I knew.</p> <p>20 Q So you read it and read it carefully?</p> <p>21 A I don't know if I read it carefully. I spent</p> <p>22 twenty hours Saturday and Sunday reading depositions</p> <p>23 and reports, so I don't know how careful that is.</p> <p>24 There's an awful lot of pages there.</p> <p>25 Q Well --</p>

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 A I speed-read which may be part of it. That's</p> <p>2 how I get through a lot of this stuff sometimes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. But did you make sure to read his</p> <p>4 deposition?</p> <p>5 A Yeah, I did read it, I think, as carefully as</p> <p>6 I read any deposition which, I mean, I get bored to</p> <p>7 tears after a little while.</p> <p>8 Q The twenty hours that you spent as</p> <p>9 basically -- this is Monday (sic), so over the last</p> <p>10 two days, you spent roughly ten hours a day doing</p> <p>11 some reading?</p> <p>12 A Yeah, I did a crash course basically to make</p> <p>13 sure that I was informed of all the issues that were</p> <p>14 coming up here and to make sure that I was informed</p> <p>15 about all the -- you know, my own report and all and</p> <p>16 that I didn't -- didn't miss anything or didn't</p> <p>17 forget anything. I mean, there's been an awful lot</p> <p>18 of water under the bridge here and --</p> <p>19 Q Right.</p> <p>20 A -- a lot of things that have happened. This</p> <p>21 mortality report has been ongoing right up until last</p> <p>22 week. I mean, I've been looking at that and making</p> <p>23 sure I, you know, understood some of the numbers that</p> <p>24 came out of it which were sometimes difficult to</p> <p>25 comprehend in the absentia of the whole thing.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 caution him when he strays from --</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: Well, that was a little</p> <p>3 bit of a stray; you're right.</p> <p>4 MR. BERNICK: Well, we were interested</p> <p>5 in the golf tournament.</p> <p>6 MR. FINCH: Or the fees --</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: You can talk that over with</p> <p>8 the doctor at the next break, Counsel.</p> <p>9 MR. BERNICK: Okay. That's fine.</p> <p>10 You're thinking that I'll -- that I won't be finished</p> <p>11 by the next break. Who knows? Maybe I'll be all</p> <p>12 done.</p> <p>13 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So, Dr. Whitehouse, how did</p> <p>14 you -- did you make a special request of</p> <p>15 Mr. Heberling to get the Frank transcript?</p> <p>16 A I don't actually recall.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. As a result of reading any of the</p> <p>18 depositions, did you do any further work in</p> <p>19 connection with the case?</p> <p>20 A No, I don't think so, but I did -- as part of</p> <p>21 all the stuff that I was reading was making sure I</p> <p>22 went over all the data sheets on various things that</p> <p>23 I've done over the last year or so to be sure that I</p> <p>24 had all the numbers -- the important numbers in my</p> <p>25 head.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Before this last week ended -- let's</p> <p>2 just strike that.</p> <p>3 The crash courses, you call it, and I'm</p> <p>4 not -- there's no particular magic to that term, but</p> <p>5 was that in anticipation of your being deposed today?</p> <p>6 A Yeah.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. That's fair and we appreciate your</p> <p>8 undertaking that effort.</p> <p>9 Prior to this last weekend, had you read</p> <p>10 Dr. Frank's deposition?</p> <p>11 A Prior to this last weekend?</p> <p>12 Q Yes.</p> <p>13 A I'm not sure. I only got it, I think, about</p> <p>14 Tuesday or Wednesday and then I had a number of other</p> <p>15 things that were going on, and so I don't -- I really</p> <p>16 could not. I would have done it sooner if I could</p> <p>17 have.</p> <p>18 Q Okay.</p> <p>19 A But my wife was involved in a charity golf</p> <p>20 tournament and, of course, she enlisted me doing all</p> <p>21 the work.</p> <p>22 MR. LEWIS: Doctor, I should remind you</p> <p>23 just to answer the question that's been asked. Okay?</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>25 MR. BERNICK: And we'll be sure to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 Q So basically over this last weekend, you sat</p> <p>2 down to do the final prep for your dep and you had a</p> <p>3 whole collection of materials that included expert</p> <p>4 reports, depositions, and other information that you</p> <p>5 wanted to make sure that you reviewed before you were</p> <p>6 deposed, fair?</p> <p>7 A Fair enough.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. I want to first ask you about your</p> <p>9 experience and seeing patients who had</p> <p>10 asbestos-related illness outside of Libby, that is,</p> <p>11 people whose exposure wasn't related to Libby. Okay?</p> <p>12 How many cases -- how many people have you</p> <p>13 seen where you diagnosed asbestos-related illness</p> <p>14 from exposures outside of Libby?</p> <p>15 A I don't know the answer to that exactly. I</p> <p>16 have estimated I probably have seen over the years as</p> <p>17 many as 500.</p> <p>18 Q 500 people that you diagnosed or 500 people</p> <p>19 that you saw in connection with the possibility that</p> <p>20 they had asbestos-related illness?</p> <p>21 A Well, that's a good question because -- and I</p> <p>22 don't know that I can answer that question. I mean,</p> <p>23 it probably -- it may be half and half. There were a</p> <p>24 lot of them that were sent to me for confirmation of</p> <p>25 a diagnosis by Washington Labor and Industry.</p>

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Is it true that with respect to your 2 experience in seeing people with asbestos-related 3 illness not related to Libby that you have published 4 no papers? 5 A No, I have published no papers. 6 Q Is it also true that with respect to those 7 people you have not provided or you're not aware of 8 anybody who's provided medical files relating to 9 those people to anybody involved in this bankruptcy 10 case? 11 A No. 12 Q Is it true? Is what I said true? 13 A That's correct. That's correct, yes. 14 Q Is it true that in connection with your work 15 on this case and the reports that you've done and the 16 testimony that you've offered that you've provided -- 17 presented no data relating to patients that you've 18 seen with asbestos-related illness unrelated to 19 Libby? 20 A That's correct. 21 Q Okay. And I think you said in your own words 22 this morning that pretty much you've studied strictly 23 asbestos disease in Libby; is that correct? 24 A Not entirely. I read pieces of literature 25 over the years, but the -- most of the work that I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 A Well, it's treated as such in the literature. 2 There's obviously confusion in that literature though 3 in that there's data or reports concerning confluent 4 pleural plaques and their effect on lung function 5 which makes you wonder whether -- about that -- where 6 does confluent pleural plaques leave off and diffuse 7 pleural thickening begins. It sort of sounds like 8 the same thing, but it is treated pretty much as a 9 separate disease in the literature. 10 Q I asked -- I just asked Dr. Frank, I said, is 11 it true that the scientific literature defined a 12 diagnostic entity called diffuse pleural thickening 13 at least as of the 1970s and without relationship to 14 Libby, Montana, and his answer was yes. 15 A I would concur with that. 16 Q Okay. And, in fact, we can go throughout the 17 literature during this whole period of time and 18 whether or not diffuse pleural thickening is defined 19 to include what you called confluent plaques or not, 20 the literature has regarded diffuse pleural 21 thickening as a distinct diagnostic entity, fair? 22 A That's fair. 23 Q Okay. Is it also true that diffuse pleural 24 thickening has been studied scientifically over those 25 years at least since the 1970s?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 did concerning those people with chrysotile exposure 2 was pretty well before the Libby thing all broke, and 3 so there wasn't any driving force for me to maintain 4 data or anything like that. 5 Q Okay. But let me -- that's fair and let me 6 just ask you this question: Is it accurate that 7 you've not done any scientific analysis of diffuse 8 pleural thickening in any patient population outside 9 of Libby? 10 A That's true. 11 Q Let's talk a little bit about diffuse pleural 12 thickening in the literature which, of course, is 13 going to relate to folks outside of Libby, right? 14 A Most of it does, yes. 15 Q Well, there's not any -- there's no published 16 literature about diffuse pleural thickening in Libby 17 specifically, correct? 18 A That's correct. 19 Q So if we want to talk about diffuse pleural 20 thickening in the published literature, we're talking 21 about that disease as it's been studied and published 22 for people outside of Libby, fair? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Okay. Would you agree that diffuse pleural 25 thickening is a distinct diagnostic entity?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 A Yes. 2 Q Is it true that there are papers that have 3 been published and presented that specifically focus 4 on the pathology or pathological presentation of 5 diffuse pleural thickening? 6 MR. LEWIS: Objection. That's a 7 compound question. 8 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Go ahead and answer. 9 MR. LEWIS: Which is it? Which 10 question do you want him to answer, Counsel? 11 MR. BERNICK: I don't think it's 12 compound. 13 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Do you understand the 14 question? 15 A No. Why don't you repeat it, please? 16 Q Is it true that there are papers that have 17 been published and presented focused specifically on 18 the pathology or pathological presentation of diffuse 19 pleural thickening? 20 A I'm sure there have been. 21 Q Is it also true that there are papers that 22 have specifically sought to measure the effect of 23 diffuse pleural thickening on lung function? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Okay. Now, I first want to talk about</p>

30 (Pages 114 to 117)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 Dr. Frank's background and then I want to talk about 2 your background. Let's begin with Dr. Frank. 3 Is it true that Dr. Frank has published no 4 papers regarding diffuse pleural thickening? 5 A I would have to take your word for that. 6 Q Are you aware of any? 7 A I'm not aware of any. 8 Q Are you aware of Dr. Frank ever presenting 9 any papers regarding diffuse pleural thickening? 10 A I have no idea. 11 Q Are you aware of whether Dr. Frank has ever 12 even studied the scientific literature regarding the 13 effect of diffuse pleural thickening on lung 14 function? 15 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Argumentative. 16 MR. BERNICK: Well, all 17 cross-examination is argumentative. 18 MR. LEWIS: No, but that one -- 19 MR. BERNICK: You think that one was a 20 little bit over the line? I'll rephrase it. 21 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Is it true that Dr. Frank 22 has not himself studied the scientific literature 23 regarding the impact of diffuse pleural thickening on 24 lung function? 25 A I have no idea what he's studied.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 those reports? 2 A Well, I assume probably -- well -- 3 Q You don't have to assume. You just -- 4 A I can't -- 5 Q As counsel will tell you, if you know, say. 6 If you don't know, say you don't know. 7 MR. LEWIS: Exactly correct. That's 8 what I'd like you to do. If you know, answer the 9 question truthfully. If you don't know, say you 10 don't know. 11 A I don't really know. 12 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay. Well, did you review 13 those reports before they were issued? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Did you write those reports? 16 A Yes. 17 Q You wrote them word by word? 18 A Not word for word. The way I do the reports 19 is that I write down all the various things, go over 20 the various things with the attorney or the 21 secretaries and their secretaries type it up for me 22 because I don't have a typist available to me. 23 Q Okay. So you write them out in hand? 24 A I do some in hand and some of them I do 25 verbally and then I check a draft and then make a lot</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 Q Well, we asked him those questions. Did you 2 see in his deposition I asked him those questions? 3 A You know, I did miss that. Off the periphery 4 for a minute, I -- I didn't pay that much attention 5 to -- 6 Q Well, I will tell you that he testified in 7 his deposition that he had not done a review of the 8 literature on the impairment associated with diffuse 9 pleural thickening. 10 A Okay. 11 Q And my question -- and was not able to answer 12 my questions on that, so I then get to this question: 13 You -- in this case -- I should say -- in this case, 14 we've received expert reports authored by you? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And we've also received expert reports that 17 purport to be expert reports authored jointly by you 18 and Dr. Frank and have both your names on them? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Do you know what I'm talking about? 21 A I do. 22 Q Who actually wrote Dr. Frank's name on those 23 reports? 24 A Who actually wrote his name? 25 Q Yeah. Who decided to include his name on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 of corrections to that and then send it back and get 2 it typed. 3 Q But the content of the reports that had both 4 your name and Dr. Frank's name, the content of the 5 reports is all yours? 6 A Mostly mine. 7 Q Well -- 8 A He added some things to it. I'm not quite 9 sure what all was added in retrospect, but I know 10 that it was run by him and then he made changes in 11 it. 12 Q Okay. But in terms of the original 13 authorship, you are the original author of all 14 reports that bear your name? 15 A Yeah, basically. 16 Q Okay. Whose idea was it to have both 17 Dr. Frank and you be -- have the same report? 18 A I don't know. 19 Q Well -- 20 A I don't know whether it was his idea or 21 whether it was the attorney's. It wasn't mine. 22 Q It wasn't yours? 23 A No. 24 Q Well, but if it wasn't your idea, why was it 25 done?</p>

31 (Pages 118 to 121)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 A Well, there's no reason why we couldn't not 2 do a joint report. We've discussed all kinds of 3 things -- 4 Q Well, that report -- 5 A -- Dr. Frank and I have. 6 Q That report purports to reflect not only your 7 opinions, but Dr. Frank's opinions, right? 8 A That's correct. 9 Q And we learned from Dr. Frank that he didn't 10 know of some of the literature and some of the 11 opinions that were in the report, so whose idea was 12 it that the report would be for both him and you? 13 MR. LEWIS: Objection. That question 14 has been asked and answered a couple of times now. 15 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Well, let me just ask -- 16 I'll withdraw it. 17 Didn't -- wasn't -- had you ever before 18 issued an expert report in connectin with litigation 19 which was a joint report of yourself and somebody 20 else? 21 A No. 22 Q Well, didn't it strike you a little bit odd 23 that that was happening here? 24 A No, not particularly because, you know, I met 25 with Dr. Frank a number of times in Libby and we</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 associated with pleural disease that were mentioned 2 in the ATS 2004 paper that you hadn't even read, 3 right? 4 A That I -- I didn't know whether I read them. 5 I didn't -- I didn't look exactly at the sites. 6 There were three of them there at that point and I 7 don't know whether I read them or not. I don't think 8 I did, but I don't know for sure. 9 Q Well, but you come here to offer expert 10 opinions regarding diffuse pleural thickening and I 11 know that you -- I know the basis of your expert 12 opinions insofar as Libby is concerned or I think I 13 do. We're going to get to that in a minute, but what 14 I'm really exploring is the degree to which you can 15 hold yourself out as being an expert in what the 16 scientific literature says about diffuse pleural 17 thickening outside of Libby. 18 MR. LEWIS: Objection. That's a speech 19 of counsel. It's not a question. 20 MR. BERNICK: Then wait for the 21 question. 22 MR. LEWIS: Well -- 23 MR. BERNICK: I'll ask a question. 24 MR. LEWIS: It's completely loaded up. 25 It's an improper question, Counsel. You're very</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 discussed all kinds of things relative to Libby 2 cases, and so having a joint report -- it didn't seem 3 that out of line to me, no. 4 Q And you just don't know whether it was his 5 idea or the attorney's idea? 6 A I don't. 7 Q Okay. Let's turn to your own background. 8 It's true, is it not, that you have not 9 published any papers at all on diffuse pleural 10 thickening? 11 A That's correct. 12 Q Is it true that you have presented no papers 13 on diffuse pleural thickening? 14 A True. 15 Q Is it true that you've not made a systematic 16 study of the literature, the scientific literature on 17 diffuse pleural thickening? 18 A I have read a lot of literature concerning 19 diffuse pleural thickening. 20 Q I understand that. 21 A Whether that's systematic or not, I don't 22 know that I could answer that. 23 Q Well, but that's -- I mean, you already told 24 Mr. Finch as an example that there were papers that 25 dealt with the progressive loss of lung function</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 experienced. You know it was improper. 2 MR. BERNICK: No, I think it's very 3 proper because it tells the witness very candidly 4 exactly where I'm going. 5 MR. LEWIS: No, it's loaded up. It's 6 very argumentative. 7 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Here's my question to you, 8 Dr. Whitehouse, in order to -- so as to not prolong 9 the agony: Have you done a comprehensive review of 10 the scientific literature regarding the impact of 11 diffuse pleural thickening on lung function? 12 A Define comprehensive. 13 Q Well, it's not a huge piece of -- it's not a 14 huge body of literature, is it? 15 A Oh, there's a lot of literature. I mean, 16 there's literature not only in the U.S., but in 17 Australia, South Africa, in Great Britain, and I've 18 read literature from all those areas. Now, I don't 19 know what the definition of comprehensive is. 20 Q Well, have you done a system -- have you done 21 a -- have you done a literature search, a scientific 22 articles search to gather those studies that focus 23 specifically on diffuse pleural thickening and its 24 impact on lung function? Have you done that? 25 A I haven't done it systematically.</p>

32 (Pages 122 to 125)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 Q If I were to ask you about different results 2 and different studies, that is, when does diffuse 3 pleural thickening lead to a measurable loss of lung 4 function or not, would you be able to tell me the 5 different studies and their different results on that 6 very specific issue? 7 A You mean you want me to actually quote an 8 article and what the article says? 9 Q I want you to be able to talk with me about 10 it in the deposition because I really want to know if 11 you hold yourself out as an expert in the differing 12 results that have been seen when data has been 13 gathered on the impact of diffuse pleural thickening 14 on lung function. 15 MR. LEWIS: You finished? 16 MR. BERNICK: Yeah. 17 MR. LEWIS: Objection. That's not a 18 question. That's a statement of counsel. I move 19 that it be stricken. 20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Can you hold yourself out 21 as an expert in the differing results that have been 22 recorded in the scientific literature when scientists 23 have asked what is the impact of diffuse pleural 24 thickening on lung function? 25 A Well, to begin with, I don't use the term</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 Q But a lot of other people do, people in your 2 field. 3 A Well, I don't. 4 Q Well, I'm just asking you: Do you consider 5 yourself to be a person who can speak authoritatively 6 to what all the literature says outside of Libby 7 about the impact of diffuse pleural thickening on 8 specific lung function results? 9 A You used the term all the literature, and, 10 no, I have not read all the literature, every piece 11 of the literature. I've read a substantial portion 12 of the literature. I don't even know what the 13 percentage is. 14 Q So you don't know what you don't know? 15 A Yeah, I think I know what I don't know. 16 Q Okay. 17 A What I don't know is -- also gets quoted in a 18 lot of these articles you read. What I haven't -- I 19 shouldn't say don't know. What I haven't read 20 necessarily is also summarized in a lot of these 21 articles. 22 Q Okay. So if you give answers to my questions 23 today about when and under what conditions does 24 diffuse pleural thickening actually cause a 25 substantial reduction in lung function, you and I can</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 expert related to myself particularly. I basically 2 am a longstanding practitioner with very extensive 3 experience in lung disease and very extensive 4 experience in Libby disease and I have read a lot of 5 literature concerning diffuse pleural thickening that 6 I have utilized in formulating my opinions. Now, I 7 don't guess that that would be considered systematic, 8 but that's the way it is. 9 Q Fair enough. And I've always recognized that 10 you are candid in responding to questions and get to 11 the point. That is my point. We're going to get to 12 the Libby experience in a minute, but I'm talking 13 about your -- I'm talking about your expertise in 14 what's been reported outside of Libby. 15 Do you consider yourself to be an expert in 16 the science, the scientific results of what's been 17 reported outside of Libby when it comes to the impact 18 of diffuse pleural thickening on specific lung 19 function tests? 20 A I think I'm knowledgeable about what's in the 21 literature relative to that. 22 Q But do you consider yourself to be an expert 23 in what's in the literature with respect to that? 24 A I told you before, I don't use the term 25 expert --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 have a dialog on the actual data that's in the 2 literature and you'll be able to respond? You're 3 being held out as an expert in this case. You'll be 4 able to respond to that as an expert; is that fair? 5 A I can respond very accurately to what happens 6 in people in Libby, what happens to their pulmonary 7 function relative to diffuse pleural thickening. I'm 8 not going to make any attempt to summarize what 9 happens in the chrysotile world in that regard. 10 Q Can you make any attempt to summarize what 11 happens in the non-Libby -- you pick out chrysotile. 12 I'm not just focused on chrysotile. I'm -- 13 MR. LEWIS: Counsel -- Counsel -- 14 (Simultaneous talking.) 15 MR. LEWIS: I've got the floor now. 16 Don't argue with this witness. You'll have great 17 latitude. I understand this is cross-examination, 18 but just answer the -- ask questions, let the witness 19 answer. Don't make speeches, please. 20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Was your last answer 21 confined to chrysotile as opposed to amphibole? 22 A Basically, I have reviewed a great deal of 23 literature relative to amphiboles and diffuse pleural 24 thickening, particularly the Australian literature 25 which has a lot of information in it. I don't know</p>

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 how much altogether there is in the chrysotile 2 literature except that it's -- in many respects, it's 3 been neglected because of the fact there's been so 4 much emphasis on interstitial lung disease and 5 chrysotile over the years, so that's where -- that's 6 basically where I get my information from. 7 Q Okay. Let's pursue this a little bit and see 8 where it goes. 9 MR. BERNICK: And I'm sorry. That was 10 a declaratory statement by me. 11 MR. LEWIS: Yes, but it's preparatory 12 to your next line of questioning. 13 MR. BERNICK: So that's okay? 14 MR. LEWIS: I have no problem with it. 15 I'm not being a jerk here. 16 MR. BERNICK: No, I know. 17 MR. LEWIS: I'm just -- 18 MR. BERNICK: I don't think you are. I 19 think you're being fine. I disagree with what you're 20 doing, but -- 21 MR. LEWIS: I understand that. 22 MR. BERNICK: -- you look like a nice 23 guy. 24 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So the literature -- let's 25 talk a little bit about the literature. All my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 And the other layer is called the visceral 2 pleura, right? 3 A That's correct. 4 Q Okay. And when you refer to confluent 5 plaques, that's a fibrotic process that affects and 6 is evident in the parietal pleura, correct? 7 A Well, that's where it's considered that 8 plaques begin and where -- where the majority of 9 plaques are. It's not totally exclusive, but I think 10 that's probably a reasonable statement and most of 11 the plaques we see are initially on the parietal 12 pleura. 13 Q And the condition known is confluent plaques. 14 It's a condition, a fibrotic condition, involving the 15 parietal pleura, correct? 16 A That's correct. 17 Q And the visceral pleura also can 18 experience -- strike that. 19 If we take a look at definitions of diffuse 20 pleural thickening, sometimes there have been 21 definitions that diffuse pleural thickening didn't 22 include the parietal pleura, correct? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Now, we've talked about the visceral pleura. 25 The visceral pleura can also be involved in -- it can</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 questions now are going to be about the literature 2 until we get to Libby and I'll let you know. Okay? 3 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 4 Q Is it true that the literature, the 5 scientific literature reflects that there are 6 different types of diffuse pleural thickening? 7 A I think you need to define what you're saying 8 by different types of diffuse pleural thickening. 9 Q Okay. Anatomically, there are two different 10 layers of the pleural, correct? 11 A Oh, that's what you're referring to? 12 Q Well, if laypeople -- so I don't get into 13 trouble with the claimants' lawyer here, let me just 14 try to get to the questions. 15 The literature says -- or it's true 16 anatomically that there are two different layers of 17 the pleural, correct? 18 A That's correct. Well, that -- you didn't say 19 that. 20 Q Okay. And one layer is called the parietal 21 pleural, correct? 22 A Yeah, you don't need to tell me about the 23 anatomy of the chest. I'm pretty good at -- 24 Q Well, I just want to make sure that we get it 25 straight.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 have thickening as a result of asbestos exposure, 2 correct? 3 A Yes, very much so. 4 Q And there's a fibrotic process that can lead 5 to a condition called blunting of the costophrenic 6 angle, correct? 7 A Yes. 8 Q And that's a condition that affects the 9 visceral pleura, correct? 10 A Well, I think it -- no, not entirely. It 11 involves everything -- 12 Q Well -- 13 A -- if you look at -- 14 Q -- the condition of blunting of the 15 costophrenic angle, to the extent that it affects, it 16 is a fibrosis of the pleura, is a fibrosis of the 17 visceral pleura, correct? 18 A Not entirely. It involves both. If you look 19 at a blunted angle, there's no way to say that it 20 involves only one portion of the pleura than the 21 other. It's not possible to say that. 22 Q It arises as a result of fibrosis in the 23 visceral pleura, correct? 24 A I don't think that's necessarily true. If 25 you look at -- it's likely that it starts that way,</p>

34 (Pages 130 to 133)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 but it's not necessarily true because, you know, most 2 of that arises from the fact that people -- some of 3 the literature has said that, you know, 90 percent of 4 these are due to pleural effusions. Some of the 5 literature though disagrees with that. 6 Q Well, let's get specific. 7 You tell me the literature that says the 8 fibrosis involving blunting the costophrenic angle 9 arises in the parietal as opposed to the visceral 10 pleura. Tell me one study. 11 A McCloud's study demonstrates the relationship 12 of fibrosis with strands across between the visceral 13 and parietal pleural. 14 Q That's not my -- 15 MR. LEWIS: Let him finish his answer 16 and then you can inquire again, Counsel. 17 A And that's basically what we're talking about 18 when you're talking about blunting of the 19 costophrenic angle. 20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) My question, 21 Dr. Whitehouse, is simple. Tell me a single study 22 that says that the fibrotic process involved or 23 associated with blunting of the costophrenic angle 24 begins in the parietal pleura. 25 A I don't know that there's a study that says</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 word start. 2 Let's start talking etiology. Okay? The 3 etiology of blunting of the costophrenic angle, the 4 etiology says it begins with a fibrotic process 5 involving the visceral pleura, correct? 6 MR. LEWIS: I think that -- Counsel, 7 that question is compound. I don't think -- 8 MR. BERNICK: Let's make -- 9 MR. LEWIS: You don't define etiology. 10 Etiology could be something -- 11 MR. BERNICK: Just say -- 12 (Simultaneous talking.) 13 MR. BERNICK: Just say objection to 14 form, compound, or ambiguous. Okay? It's not that 15 complicated. You're just making -- you're making a 16 record. 17 MR. LEWIS: In Montana, you can't just 18 say objection to form. 19 MR. BERNICK: This is a federal -- this 20 is a federal proceeding that's taking place -- 21 MR. LEWIS: In Montana -- 22 MR. BERNICK: It's taking place -- 23 MR. LEWIS: All right. 24 MR. BERNICK: -- pursuant to a process. 25 The only reason we're in Montana is for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 it begins there. 2 Q That's what I asked you. 3 A Well, except that what I -- what I -- 4 Q What's indicated -- 5 A -- indicated to you in the McCloud -- 6 MR. LEWIS: Let him finish. 7 MR. BERNICK: No, no, that's not -- 8 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Just focus on the question 9 and answer the question. 10 A That's what I was doing. 11 Q Okay. I asked you a question. Let's be very 12 clear. Is there a single study that says that the 13 fibrosis that's consequent on blunting of the 14 costophrenic angle or associated with it starts in 15 the parietal pleura? 16 A McCloud's study demonstrates that stranding 17 occurs and there occurs an inflammatory response in 18 the parietal pleura associated with the visceral 19 pleura. 20 Q Didn't -- 21 A There's no difference between the angle and 22 the rest of the pleura. It's all part of the 23 relationship between the visceral and the parietal 24 pleura. 25 Q That's completely nonresponsive. I used the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 Dr. Whitehouse's convenience. Okay? So the Montana 2 rules -- 3 MR. LEWIS: I stand corrected. 4 MR. BERNICK: -- don't govern this 5 process. 6 MR. LEWIS: I stand corrected, Counsel. 7 All right? 8 MR. BERNICK: So I'll do my best to ask 9 clean, clear questions. 10 MR. LEWIS: And I'll do my best to 11 protect the record as well, but I'm not trying to 12 interfere with your examination. 13 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Now that we've had this 14 meaningful dialog, Dr. Whitehouse, the question to 15 you is: Isn't it a fact that where you have diffuse 16 pleural thickening arising from or associated with 17 blunting of the costophrenic angle, it originates in 18 the visceral pleura? 19 A I don't think that's necessarily known. 20 Q Well, but you tell me where's the study that 21 says otherwise. Where's the study that says -- you 22 tell me anybody who said that it originates someplace 23 else. 24 A Well, to begin with, there's a fair amount of 25 discussion and lot of argument in the literature and</p>

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 there was prior to the 2000 ILO that blunting was, 2 first off, not necessarily had to be present for 3 there to be diffuse pleural thickening. 4 Q You're answering an entirely different 5 question. 6 A No, I'm not. 7 Q I asked a very specific question. The 8 origination of a fibrotic process that is associated 9 with blunting of the costophrenic angle, tell me a 10 single study saying that it originates anywhere other 11 than the visceral pleura. I just want the study that 12 says that. 13 A I told you once before, the McCloud study 14 demonstrated fibrotic process, pleural in the 15 parietal pleural. That's what we're talking about in 16 blunting. I'm sorry, whether you like it or not. 17 Q No, you talk about the -- you talk about the 18 fact that there's fibrotic process that runs between 19 the two layers and that's not my question. 20 MR. LEWIS: My problem here, Counsel, 21 is you're arguing with the witness and that is 22 entirely improper. Ask him a question, he answers 23 it, when he's finished, then you get to inquire 24 again. You constantly cut him off and that's 25 improper.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 had a fair question there and then you had to comment 2 on it and you had to give your opinion as to it. 3 That's improper. Please ask the witness a question 4 and don't make editorial comments about your own 5 questions. 6 MR. BERNICK: Well, don't make 7 editorial comments about your objections. We can go 8 through this process and pretty soon we'll just break 9 off and call the judge. 10 MR. LEWIS: That's fine. I'm willing 11 to call in the judge right now -- 12 MR. BERNICK: This is really -- 13 MR. LEWIS: -- on your questioning this 14 witness. 15 MR. BERNICK: -- really an impediment 16 to the process here that we haven't experienced 17 before in the case. 18 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I'm just trying to find 19 out, Dr. Whitehouse, whether there's a difference 20 between diffuse pleural thickening arising from 21 confluent plaques and diffuse pleural thickening 22 associated with blunting of the costophrenic angle. 23 Tell me whether there's a difference or not. 24 A There's a difference between those two, 25 clearly.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Let me ask you this 2 question, Dr. Whitehouse: Would you agree with me 3 that the diffuse pleural thickening that's associated 4 with confluent plaques is different in origin and 5 appearance and in the origin and presentation from 6 the diffuse pleural thickening that's associated with 7 the costophrenic angle? 8 A You've made the assumption there that diffuse 9 pleural thickening has to be associated with blunting 10 of the costophrenic angle. 11 Q I didn't say that. 12 A Well -- 13 Q Just listen to my question. 14 A -- your question assumes -- 15 Q No. 16 A It does. 17 Q It's just a simple question. 18 Would you agree with me that the diffuse 19 pleural thickening that is presented in confluent 20 plaques is different in type from the diffuse pleural 21 thickening that is associated with blunting of the 22 costophrenic angle? There are two different types of 23 diffuse pleural thickening. 24 A I don't -- 25 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Counsel, you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And that clear difference has been 2 recognized in the scientific literature, correct? 3 A The difference that's been recognized that 4 you're reporting to is you're making the assumption 5 that diffuse pleural thickening is present with 6 blunting by the way the question is phrased and how 7 it's in the context of it. 8 Why don't you ask me the question, is there 9 any difference between pleural thickening that 10 doesn't involve blunting and confluent pleural 11 plaques, which would be the more logical question to 12 ask me. 13 Q That's not the question that I asked you. 14 You just said that there was two -- a clear 15 difference between diffuse pleural thickening 16 presented through confluent plaques and diffuse 17 pleural thickening that's associated with blunting of 18 the costophrenic angle. 19 A I eliminated the blunting of the angle from 20 my answer. 21 Q No, you said -- 22 A I just did in that comment that I made. 23 Q Okay. Okay. So now there's not a clear 24 difference between diffuse pleural thickening 25 involving confluent plaques and diffuse pleural</p>

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 142</p> <p>1 thickening involving blunting of the costophrenic 2 angle? There's not a clear difference? Just tell me 3 yes or no. There's no trick to it. I just want to 4 know whether they're different or not. 5 A I think there is a trick to it because -- 6 Q No. 7 A -- the trick is getting me to agree to the 8 fact that there is -- blunting has to be there with 9 the diffuse pleural thickening and -- 10 Q No. 11 A -- I'm not willing to agree to that. 12 Q No, no, no. We're going to go down that road 13 in a minute. 14 A Why don't we go down this road first and then 15 come back to that? 16 Q No, no. 17 Let's just talk about the diffuse pleural 18 thickening that is associated with blunting of the 19 costophrenic angle. Okay? Got that in mind? 20 A Okay. 21 Q Is that different? Is there a clear 22 difference between that diffuse pleural thickening 23 and diffuse pleural thickening presented through 24 confluent plaques? 25 A Yes, there obviously is. There's not a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 144</p> <p>1 thickening, isn't it the case that the literature 2 only reports impairment in the form of a restriction? 3 A Yes, I think that's true. 4 Q Okay. Now, when we deal with impairment 5 associated with confluent plaques, has the literature 6 analyzed whether there is impairment to lung function 7 associated with confluent plaques? 8 A Well, the literature has already analyzed the 9 fact that plaques themselves cause loss of lung 10 function. 11 Q I didn't ask you that. 12 A Well, that's plaques and confluent plaques 13 could be expected -- 14 Q I'm specifically talking about confluent 15 plaques. You're really going to have to listen to 16 the question carefully because otherwise we'll just 17 take a long time. 18 You talked about -- we talked about there 19 being a difference between diffuse pleural thickening 20 involving confluent plaques and diffuse pleural 21 thickening where it is associated with blunting of 22 the costophrenic angle. 23 Now, with that difference in mind, I'm asking 24 you about impairment. That's very clearly where I'm 25 going. Okay? So I'm now going to ask you a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 143</p> <p>1 problem with it in the confluence in the plaques. 2 Q Okay. And is that clear difference 3 recognized in the scientific literature? 4 A I think it is. 5 Q Okay. And now let's turn then to the 6 question of impairment associated with diffuse 7 pleural thickening. Okay? I asked Dr. Frank whether 8 the impairment associated with diffuse pleural 9 thickening was restrictive, obstructive, or both, and 10 he said that it was restrictive. Would you agree 11 with that? 12 A I think predominantly so. 13 Q Are you aware of any literature reporting 14 obstructive impairment consequent on diffuse pleural 15 thickening? 16 A As I recall, it was alluded to in the Orrig 17 article. They were mostly talking about interstitial 18 disease. 19 Q Right. 20 A But that's the only context that I know about 21 for sure. 22 Q Well, that's what I'm talking about. 23 Set aside interstitial disease. And I know 24 that you have opinions on that. I'm not going to get 25 into that. When we just talk about diffuse pleural</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 145</p> <p>1 question. 2 Is there literature that analyzes the 3 impairment that is associated -- whether impairment 4 is associated with confluent plaques, is there 5 literature that does that? 6 A I don't know for certain. I know that 7 there's literature associated with plaques. I assume 8 there is with confluent plaques. I haven't seen it. 9 Q You have not seen literature -- 10 A I don't recall a specific article that 11 relates only to confluent plaques. 12 Q Well, that's interesting because I believe 13 that you take issue with the idea that diffuse 14 pleural thickening should be confined in definition 15 to thickening that's associated with blunting of the 16 costophrenic angle. That's something you take issue 17 with, correct? 18 A Well -- 19 Q You don't like to see the definition of 20 diffuse pleural thickening confined to the condition 21 that arises in connection with blunting of the 22 costophrenic angle, correct? 23 A That's correct. 24 Q Well, but if that's true, why haven't you 25 looked to see -- looked to the literature</p>

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 specifically dealing with confluent plaques to see 2 whether it causes impairment or not? 3 MR. LEWIS: Objection. That assumes 4 facts not in evidence. 5 MR. BERNICK: No. 6 MR. LEWIS: That's not what he said. 7 MR. BERNICK: I'll rephrase the 8 question. 9 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Have you made a specific 10 review of the literature to see whether confluent 11 plaquing causes a loss of lung function? Have you 12 made that inquiry? 13 A I'll repeat again. I've looked at the 14 literature concerning plaques and you'll see the 15 notes in there and also in ATS 204 -- 2004, that 16 plaques cause loss of lung function. Schwartz has 17 written about that, and whether those are confluent 18 or just plaques, I don't know because I don't think 19 there's very much literature about confluent plaques, 20 at least I don't think I've run across it. 21 Q Well, can you say that the diffuse pleural 22 thickening presented as confluent plaques actually 23 has caused -- been shown to cause a loss of lung 24 function? 25 A I mean, how can you say otherwise when you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 A What you're asking me is whether I've looked 2 at the word confluent in it. 3 Q No, that's not what I'm asking. 4 A Yes, you are. That's exactly what you're 5 asking me. And what I said before was that I know 6 that plaques cause loss of lung function and the 7 literature is very clear on that, so there's every 8 reason to believe that confluent plaques are going to 9 lose lung function probably to more extent than plain 10 plaques, but I haven't read any literature about it. 11 Q That's my point is that whatever you might 12 expect or whatever might make sense, you haven't 13 actually looked to the scientific literature on 14 confluent plaques to see whether there is, in fact, 15 report or data showing loss of lung function, 16 correct? You haven't done that. 17 A No, I have not. 18 Q Thank you. 19 Now, the literature -- the literature that 20 you say shows that plaques have been associated with 21 the loss of lung function, that literature, you 22 haven't reviewed that systematically either, have 23 you? 24 A No, I've read a lot of that. Systematically? 25 Where is a private practitioner going to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 know plaques cause loss of lung function? What's the 2 difference between that and confluent plaques as far 3 as the loss? 4 Q Your lawyer is now going to tell you that 5 what you should do is answer the question, not ask 6 another one. 7 MR. LEWIS: I'm not going to say 8 another thing. I was just keeping you from 9 interrupting him because you want to interrupt this 10 witness every time he says something you don't like. 11 MR. BERNICK: I like everything 12 Dr. Whitehouse has to say. He knows that, and you'll 13 learn that, you know, as we go through the day. 14 Q (By Mr. Bernick) The question is pretty 15 simple. If -- confluent plaques is another way in 16 which you get pleural thickening, correct? 17 A That's correct. 18 Q Have you specifically looked into the 19 literature to see whether that type of diffuse 20 pleural thickening has been shown to cause a loss of 21 lung function? Have you done it? Yes or no. 22 MR. LEWIS: Objection. He just 23 answered the question, completely and thoroughly 24 answered the question. It's asked and answered. 25 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Go ahead and answer.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 systematically make searches of everything in the 2 literature? That doesn't happen. You read 3 literature that's pertinent. You read literature 4 that comes out. You look at it as it comes out. And 5 then you digest it and use it in your practice. 6 That's what I do. 7 Q You haven't even looked at the literature 8 cited by the ATS 2004 paper itself, correct? 9 A Why would I want to? Why is there a need to? 10 Q I didn't ask you that. You have -- 11 A Well, no, that's a legitimate answer. What 12 is the need for me to do so? 13 Q Can you actually cite me to any specific 14 study, any specific study showing that any form of 15 plaquing actually causes a loss of lung function? 16 Can you give me one study? 17 A Schwartz's article. 18 Q Schwartz? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Is that it? 21 A I know that one for certain right off the top 22 of my head. 23 Q And you're sure that that shows a loss of 24 lung function associated with plaques? 25 A I'm pretty certain about that. It also shows</p>

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 150</p> <p>1 it associated with diffuse pleural thickening. 2 There's multiple articles by Schwartz. 3 Q I'm just asking about plaques. 4 A I'm pretty sure that's where that originally 5 came from. 6 Q From Schwartz? 7 A I think so. 8 Q Is there any other study that you can talk to 9 me about which shows that pleural plaques alone have 10 an affect on lung function? 11 A Not that I can off the top of my head, no. 12 Q Now, let's change the question a little bit. 13 Let's talk about significant affect on lung function, 14 and let's even make it more. 15 I want to know about any paper that shows 16 that plaques have been associated with a reduction of 17 lung function to the point that lung function is 18 beyond the range of -- is below the range of normal. 19 Have you seen a single paper showing that any 20 form of plaque -- plaquing is associated with the 21 loss of lung function so that it's below the range of 22 normal? 23 A I can't quote one to you. 24 Q Can you -- apart from quote, are you aware 25 that there is a study, a single study -- if you'd</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 152</p> <p>1 with your statements and I'd really appreciate it if 2 you don't raise your voice and don't lean over the 3 table and be angry with me. 4 MR. LEWIS: Well -- 5 MR. BERNICK: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. 6 Let me finish now. 7 MR. LEWIS: Go ahead. 8 MR. BERNICK: I think that my 9 questioning is entirely legitimate cross-examination 10 and I don't think it's up to you to decide whether 11 it's legitimate or not legitimate cross-examination. 12 It's up to the judge to decide. And she'll have that 13 opportunity. 14 And I've examined Dr. Whitehouse before and I 15 was never accused in the very vigorous 16 cross-examination of not being fair with 17 Dr. Whitehouse by a Montana federal judge in a 18 proceeding that you're very well aware of. 19 And I'm not -- I don't think I'm treating 20 Dr. Whitehouse with disrespect. I don't think that's 21 what the record will reflect. I'm very eager and 22 anxious to get answers to very precise questions. 23 So just do me a courtesy. If you have an 24 objection, make an objection. If you believe the 25 deposition is abusive, you can always terminate it.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 151</p> <p>1 just focus on me for a moment, Dr. Whitehouse, it'll 2 expedite matters. 3 MR. LEWIS: Well, what was that, 4 Counsel? What was -- 5 MR. BERNICK: Mr. -- Dr. Whitehouse was 6 reviewing papers and wasn't looking at me, so I 7 suggested that he -- 8 MR. LEWIS: Well, you're asking him 9 about papers and -- 10 MR. BERNICK: No. 11 MR. LEWIS: -- I think he's entitled to 12 look at papers. 13 MR. BERNICK: No. 14 MR. LEWIS: He doesn't have to even 15 look at you when he's answering the question. You 16 presume too much, Counsel. You need to be fair to 17 the witness. Okay? You make speeches and you say 18 answer it yes or no. You're entitled to do some of 19 that, but this is getting over the top. You should 20 be respectful to the witness and not argue with him 21 on every answer that he gives. 22 MR. BERNICK: Are you done with the 23 lecture? 24 MR. LEWIS: I'm done with my statement. 25 MR. BERNICK: Okay. Let's dispense</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 153</p> <p>1 I don't believe it is abusive at all. 2 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Dr. Whitehouse, I now want 3 to ask you, again, the same very specific question. 4 Are you aware of any study, that there is 5 even a study, showing that plaquing can cause a 6 reduction of lung function so that it's below the 7 range of normal? 8 A Would you give me a moment to review this 9 article? I'm not sure whether it's in here or not. 10 Q Okay. If you could just tell us what the 11 article is while you're -- 12 A It's the Schwartz article. It's one of his. 13 This is the '89 one. There's also one from 2000, 14 2001. This is the one that demonstrated that the FVC 15 one was -- that the FVC was decreased by plaques. 16 (Peruses document.) 17 Unfortunately, he doesn't present this -- 18 this is 10 percent as predicted, but he reports that 19 in pleural fibrosis, the decrease in FVC associated 20 with people with circumscribed plaques is 3.75 versus 21 4.09 which is basically .343 -- 340 cc's, which is 22 about pushing ten percent loss, and that with diffuse 23 pleural thickening, it's about a liter, which is 24 clearly below the normal range in his study. 25 Q Right.</p>

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 A So I don't know whether that's actually below 2 the range of normal or not, but it's got to be very 3 close. 4 Q Well -- 5 A He reported it as such. 6 Q Okay. Are you sure that that's ten percent? 7 A Pretty close to it. 8 Q Not pretty close. You're here as an expert. 9 Do you know? 10 A 4.09 and 3.16, okay, it's -- it's about eight 11 percent. 12 Q Eight percent? 13 A Maybe nine percent. 14 Q Does that reflect -- does that reflect that 15 the resulting loss of lung function is below the 16 range of normal? 17 A It all depends where the first one started. 18 Depends what 4.09 liters plus or minus .91, whether 19 that is actually, indeed, 100 percent or whether it's 20 a population of which the -- everybody was 90 percent 21 of predicted. Depends on what the normal values he 22 used. 23 Q So that's my whole point. 24 Can you tell me as an expert today of a 25 single study which shows that plaquing alone results</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 loss of -- strike that. 2 Blunting can be associated -- I don't like 3 that one either. 4 If you take a look at the studies, there are 5 studies that focus specifically on the association of 6 blunting with loss of lung function, correct? 7 A Well, they're associated with diffuse plural 8 thickening and you're using that as part of the 9 definition. 10 Q Yes. Well -- 11 A I'm saying that if you don't have -- 12 Q I'll rephrase my question. 13 A -- blunting, you don't have diffuse pleural 14 thickening. 15 Q You're correct to correct me, so I'll 16 rephrase the question. 17 There are studies that look to examine 18 whether the diffuse pleural thickening associated 19 with blunting of the costophrenic angle leads to or 20 is associated with a loss of lung function, correct? 21 A Yes, there's more lung function in that 22 group, yes. 23 Q Okay. And those studies do show that diffuse 24 pleural thickening associated with a loss of blunting 25 of the costophrenic angle can lead to a loss of lung</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 in a loss of lung function below the range of normal? 2 A No, I probably can't, although I think that 3 this demonstrates significant loss. 4 Q But I didn't ask you about significant loss. 5 I'm talking about severe loss. 6 A Well -- 7 Q This talks all about severe -- 8 A No. 9 Q -- loss. 10 A Not with plaquing alone. Diffuse pleural 11 thickening, yes. 12 Q Well, diffuse pleural -- I want to make sure 13 that we don't have a problem there either. 14 Can you tell me of a single study anywhere 15 which shows that confluent plaquing results in a 16 severe loss of lung function? 17 A No, and I don't think he discusses that in 18 this article either. 19 Q Can you tell me a single study anywhere that 20 shows confluent plaquing results in a loss of lung 21 function below the range of normal? 22 A I'm not aware of any. 23 Q Now, let's talk about blunting. 24 A Yes. 25 Q Blunting is associated with a substantial</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 function that is both significant and severe, 2 correct? 3 A That's correct. 4 Q And, in fact, produces a reduction of lung 5 function to below normal ranges, correct? 6 A That's correct. 7 Q Would you, therefore, agree with me that the 8 diffuse pleural thickening associated with blunting 9 of the costophrenic angle has a clear track record of 10 being associated also with very severe impairment? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And is it also true that it is for that 13 reason -- I'm not here to debate with you whether the 14 definitions are good or bad, but would it be fair to 15 say that it's for that reason that some scientists 16 have decided to define diffuse pleural thickening by 17 including in the definition blunting of the 18 costophrenic angle? 19 A I suspect that that may very well be the 20 reason why they decided to do so, but what I've been 21 saying and what's in the data that we produced is 22 that we've got about half of these people that died 23 with diffuse pleural thickening and there was no 24 blunting, and by definition then, they don't have it, 25 so that's crazy if you have a definition that doesn't</p>

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 158</p> <p>1 explain what they've got.</p> <p>2 Q Didn't I say that I'm not focused on whether</p> <p>3 the definition is right or wrong?</p> <p>4 A I am.</p> <p>5 Q Well, that's great, and so when you have your</p> <p>6 opportunity to testify, if you want to talk about the</p> <p>7 definitions, that's fine with me.</p> <p>8 A I certainly will.</p> <p>9 Q I'm not going to ask you about the definition</p> <p>10 excepting and only in one respect. I think that you</p> <p>11 answered this question, but you then went on to make</p> <p>12 a long statement, so I want to make very sure that</p> <p>13 we're in agreement on this.</p> <p>14 One of the reasons why some scientists have</p> <p>15 decided to define diffuse pleural thickening by</p> <p>16 including in the definition blunting of the</p> <p>17 costophrenic angle is that the literature has shown</p> <p>18 that where diffuse pleural thickening is associated</p> <p>19 with blunting, there's a very substantial risk of</p> <p>20 severe impairment, correct?</p> <p>21 A That's correct.</p> <p>22 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Argumentative.</p> <p>23 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Now, the scientists that</p> <p>24 have decided to define diffuse pleural thickening in</p> <p>25 a way that includes a requirement to blunting, those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 160</p> <p>1 A That's true.</p> <p>2 Q And with respect to the ILO, while you've</p> <p>3 been critical of the ILO, the ILO is an independent,</p> <p>4 rigorous review process and it's very important in</p> <p>5 the medical community what the ILO has to say about</p> <p>6 this, correct?</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Compound.</p> <p>8 Argumentative.</p> <p>9 MR. BERNICK: I'll break it down.</p> <p>10 Q (By Mr. Bernick) The ILO is an</p> <p>11 independent -- it's an independent research and</p> <p>12 pronouncement process, correct?</p> <p>13 A The ILO is supposedly an epidemiological tool</p> <p>14 for the establishment of extent of disease in</p> <p>15 populations and cohorts. Okay? It's not used that</p> <p>16 way any more, unfortunately, even though it was</p> <p>17 designed that way.</p> <p>18 Q I'm very interested in that. That's not the</p> <p>19 answer to my question.</p> <p>20 I said independent. The ILO is regarded as</p> <p>21 being independent, correct?</p> <p>22 A I guess so, yeah.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And the ILO is regarded as being -- it</p> <p>24 involves participation of people who are high</p> <p>25 quality, recognized scientists, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 159</p> <p>1 scientists are actually in the mainstream of</p> <p>2 researchers in diffuse pleural thickening, correct?</p> <p>3 A I'm not sure I can answer that question.</p> <p>4 Q Are you aware -- well, certainly, the --</p> <p>5 Dr. Frank has told us that ATS 2004 itself can be</p> <p>6 reasonably interpreted to say that blunting is part</p> <p>7 of what diffuse pleural thickening is, that it's a</p> <p>8 requirement, correct?</p> <p>9 A Oh, it does say that, yes.</p> <p>10 Q In the same --</p> <p>11 A But you're talking about experts, you know,</p> <p>12 in the scientific sense here. Are you talking about</p> <p>13 experts in the 2004 -- are you talking about the</p> <p>14 experts involved in this trial?</p> <p>15 Q Okay. I'm talking about the experts involved</p> <p>16 in the scientific community, whether or not they are</p> <p>17 part of this trial. I'm talking about people who are</p> <p>18 recognized as being authorities in the scientific</p> <p>19 community in this area.</p> <p>20 The mainstream of those people say that</p> <p>21 diffuse pleural thickening requires there be blunting</p> <p>22 of the costophrenic angle, correct?</p> <p>23 A That's correct, that's what they say.</p> <p>24 Q That's true of the ATS and that's true of the</p> <p>25 ILO, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 161</p> <p>1 A I assume so.</p> <p>2 Q You're not aware -- you're not here to say</p> <p>3 that in some fashion the ILO process or the people</p> <p>4 who are involved are biased, are you?</p> <p>5 A There's a number of articles out that -- and</p> <p>6 I can't quote them to you right off, the authors, but</p> <p>7 there are a number of articles which can be provided</p> <p>8 to you that demonstrate there's an incredible</p> <p>9 variation between ILO readers that tends to make the</p> <p>10 ILO system very difficult to use.</p> <p>11 Q I didn't ask you about any of that. I said</p> <p>12 biased. Are you saying that the --</p> <p>13 A Well, is that a bias or what is it then? I</p> <p>14 mean --</p> <p>15 Q Those are B-readers, interreader variability</p> <p>16 among B-readers. Nothing to do with my question.</p> <p>17 I'm talking about the process whereby the ILO</p> <p>18 classification systems are developed and issued by</p> <p>19 way of pronouncement, that process.</p> <p>20 A The way it was developed --</p> <p>21 Q Yes.</p> <p>22 A -- fine, I don't disagree with that.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Well, that's -- that's fine. That's</p> <p>24 what I'm asking you about.</p> <p>25 You don't disagree with the way that the ILO</p>

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 2000 classification was developed in terms of its 2 independence or the quality of the scientists 3 involved, do you? 4 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Asked and 5 answered. 6 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Do you disagree -- do you 7 believe that -- strike that. 8 Do you have any issue with the quality and 9 independence of the science and the scientific 10 process that led to the development of ILO 2000? 11 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Asked and 12 answered. 13 A No, with the following exception, the ILO 14 standards were pretty much developed around 15 conventional asbestos disease and I'm trying to 16 relate to you something that's different that relates 17 to Libby asbestos. 18 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I'm not talking about that. 19 I understand that where -- 20 A Well -- 21 Q Did I say -- did I say to you, 22 Dr. Whitehouse -- 23 A These are -- 24 Q I -- 25 A These are also intermingled. It's very</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Fine. 2 Would you also recognize that they focused 3 specifically on diffuse pleural thickening as part of 4 their process in 2000? 5 A They -- they did. I guess you would be 6 reasonable to say that they did, whereas, prior to 7 that, they had not focused very much on it -- 8 Q Okay. 9 A -- but they did spend more time on it. 10 Q Okay. And would you also agree with me that 11 if we look in the literature for -- you said that the 12 mainstream definition now includes blunting of the 13 costophrenic angle. Are you aware of anybody who has 14 written a peer-reviewed article anywhere in the 15 scientific literature that says it is wrong to 16 require blunting of the costophrenic angle in the 17 definition of diffuse pleural thickening? 18 A I haven't seen that it says that in the 19 literature, no. 20 Q Now, let's talk a little bit about 21 interstitial asbestos, although if people are getting 22 a little hungry, we can -- 23 MR. BERNICK: Are the sandwiches 24 around? 25 MR. LONGOSZ: Should be over down the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 difficult to separate one from the other. I'm sorry. 2 Q Fine. 3 Did I say to you that we'll reach a point in 4 the deposition where we'll talk about Libby? I said 5 that, right? 6 A Yes, you did. 7 Q Okay. We're going to -- we're not there yet, 8 so I'm just asking you about the ILO scientific 9 process itself. 10 A The original process, I'm sure, was done 11 appropriately and I'm sure it was done in 1980 12 appropriately when they did it originally. 13 Q Okay. 14 A What I was referring to was not that then. 15 Maybe it's a little of that. I don't know. But I'm 16 referring to practical usage as it is currently used. 17 Q I'm not -- I'm not even talking about that. 18 I'm just talking about the ILO 2000 classification 19 document. 20 A Okay. 21 Q Do you have any issue with the fact that it 22 was developed by independent scientists who were 23 recognized as being authoritative in their field? 24 A I don't have any reason to believe otherwise, 25 no.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 hall. 2 MR. BERNICK: Let me know if you want 3 to -- are you a little bit peckish? 4 THE WITNESS: This is probably a good 5 time. 6 MR. BERNICK: What? 7 THE WITNESS: Probably a good time for 8 a break anyway and have lunch. It's 12:30. 9 MR. BERNICK: Okay. 10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the 11 record. The time is now 12:30 p.m. 12 (Lunch recess.) 13 (Mr. Stansbury exits.) 14 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 15 record. The time now is 12:50 p.m. 16 EXAMINATION (Continuing) 17 BY MR. BERNICK: 18 Q Dr. Whitehouse, I want to shift gears here 19 and ask you some questions about interstitial 20 asbestosis and then we'll go back to pleural 21 thickening for the rest of the dep, but just some 22 basics. 23 Would you agree that the scientific 24 literature recognizes interstitial asbestosis as 25 being a distinct diagnostic entity?</p>

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 166</p> <p>1 A Yes, the literature does, yeah.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And pathologically, interstitial</p> <p>3 asbestosis involves a fibrotic process in the</p> <p>4 parenchyma of the lung, correct?</p> <p>5 A Correct.</p> <p>6 Q And it can be progressive?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And it can result in substantial impairment,</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Would you also agree with me that in the</p> <p>12 literature, interstitial asbestos can range from mild</p> <p>13 to very severe, both -- just leave it at that, from</p> <p>14 mild to very severe?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And can do so both in the extent of the</p> <p>17 fibrosis and in the extent of the impairment?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Would you agree with me that scientific</p> <p>20 convention in the area of asbestosis says that both</p> <p>21 the degree of fibrosis and the degree of impairment</p> <p>22 can be rated or measured?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q So that when it comes to the extent of</p> <p>25 fibrosis, B-readers, people who are certified to read</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 168</p> <p>1 to be severe, although there's people who disagree</p> <p>2 about it and there's people that -- there's a lot of</p> <p>3 variation between observers in those numbers.</p> <p>4 (Ms. Rickards returns from lunch</p> <p>5 recess.)</p> <p>6 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay. Now, you were asked</p> <p>7 some questions about the trust distribution</p> <p>8 procedures or TDPs in the plan of this case, and I</p> <p>9 want to show you what I think is your Exhibit-2. Do</p> <p>10 you have it here someplace?</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: That's right over here.</p> <p>12 Q (By Mr. Bernick) We don't want you to walk</p> <p>13 off with these, Dr. Whitehouse.</p> <p>14 MR. LEWIS: Are you accusing this</p> <p>15 witness --</p> <p>16 Q (By Mr. Bernick) We would be confused</p> <p>17 forever.</p> <p>18 A -2, you said?</p> <p>19 MR. LEWIS: Yeah, looks like this.</p> <p>20 A That's the one I was looking for.</p> <p>21 (Mr. Longosz returns from lunch</p> <p>22 recess.)</p> <p>23 Q (By Mr. Bernick) If you take a look at</p> <p>24 Page 26 of Exhibit-2, do you see severe asbestosis as</p> <p>25 one of the categories? It's category -- or level</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 167</p> <p>1 x-rays for fibrosis, will have the ability to rate</p> <p>2 the degree of fibrosis using the ILO system, right?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And when it comes to impairment, scientific</p> <p>5 convention measures the impairment associated with</p> <p>6 asbestosis through basically lung function tests</p> <p>7 including forced vital capacity among others,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. All that is very plain scientific</p> <p>11 convention, correct?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Now, let's talk a little bit about severe</p> <p>14 asbestosis.</p> <p>15 Scientifically, is there a bright line test</p> <p>16 for when asbestosis is severe? And by asbestosis, I</p> <p>17 mean interstitial asbestosis.</p> <p>18 A Oh, there's been attempts to quantitate it by</p> <p>19 FVC, but they're not very accurate.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. What about in terms of the degree of</p> <p>21 fibrosis? Are there bright line medical tests for</p> <p>22 when asbestosis is severe in terms of degree of</p> <p>23 fibrosis?</p> <p>24 A Well, I think most people think it's, you</p> <p>25 know, you get past ILO 3/3 or 3/2, then it's thought</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 169</p> <p>1 4-A. Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A Yeah.</p> <p>3 Q And you're aware, are you not, that the</p> <p>4 TDP -- this aspect of the TDP basically is a part of</p> <p>5 a process where people can either qualify for</p> <p>6 compensation based upon an expedited review or if</p> <p>7 they choose, look for compensation about it based</p> <p>8 upon an individual review. Are you -- I know you're</p> <p>9 not an expert in it, but are you generally familiar</p> <p>10 with the expedited review versus the individual</p> <p>11 review?</p> <p>12 A Yeah, I am, and I would -- another thing, I</p> <p>13 did make an error concerning the ILO of 3/2. It's</p> <p>14 actually 2/1 --</p> <p>15 Q Okay.</p> <p>16 A -- concerning severe asbestosis.</p> <p>17 Q So basically as you understand the TDP when</p> <p>18 it comes to these definitions of severe asbestosis at</p> <p>19 level 4-A is an expedited or a set of benchmarks for</p> <p>20 an expedited review based upon a paper submission.</p> <p>21 Is that your general understanding?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Now, I want to suggest to you and I</p> <p>24 want you to accept for purposes of the questions that</p> <p>25 I'm going to ask you that the TDP criteria for this</p>

43 (Pages 166 to 169)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 expedited review are designed to pick out and qualify 2 for compensation cases of severe asbestosis that can 3 be established through objective criteria and are 4 clear cases. That is, it's not looking for the 5 borderline cases. It's looking for the clear cases. 6 I want you to assume that for purposes of my 7 question. 8 And in light of that, if we take a look at 9 level IV-A, as you see it, does this use criteria for 10 severity based both upon the presentation of the 11 disease and upon the impairment? Is this a category 12 that works with both the disease presentation as well 13 as the impairment? 14 A Probably as best as it can be, yeah. 15 Q Okay. And that's really what I wanted to get 16 to next is that you see that it uses -- the severe 17 asbestosis TDP calls for an ILO of 2/1 or greater for 18 asbestosis determined by pathological evidence. 19 Is it true that with that test the scientific 20 literature says that that test will, in fact, succeed 21 in picking out and qualifying patients that do, in 22 fact, have very significant fibrosis? 23 A The only caveat I have is that -- yeah, if 24 you sent it to Sam Hammer, you'd get a good answer. 25 Okay? If you sent it to some other path labs that I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 Kalispell. 2 The docs tend to either not have the 3 equipment or don't know exactly how to do it, so the 4 problem is that -- and I'm not arguing with those 5 criteria, by the way. I want you to be aware of 6 that, but the problem is when you're talking about 7 pathologic specimens, I think you're going to get a 8 lot of people that are going to -- they submit 9 something like that, say, from a lung biopsy or 10 something like that, the asbestos fibers will be 11 missed and it won't be called asbestosis. 12 Q Fair enough. 13 But where the pathology does find 14 asbestosis -- 15 A That's fine. 16 Q -- which is what the TDP requires, those will 17 be pretty clear cases of significant fibrosis, 18 correct? 19 A It could be misleading. You could -- you 20 could be picking up a case where it's not significant 21 or doesn't meet an ILO standard of 2/1. It meets -- 22 it's maybe 1/1 or something like that, but I would 23 assume though that it wouldn't have gotten submitted 24 unless the vital capacity was low or some other 25 reason.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 know about, the chances are that you're not going to 2 get the correct answer -- 3 Q Okay. 4 A -- because of the sophistication of the 5 equipment necessary to make a decent answer and 6 generally TEM, and so, you know, electron microscopy. 7 Q But if the goal is to pick up clear cases for 8 expedited treatment of people with significant 9 fibrosis, doesn't science say that if you have 10 pathological pathologists who says that it's 11 asbestosis, that's going to be -- that's going to be 12 a requirement that -- strike that. Strike all that. 13 I want to rephrase this just to be simple. 14 We've got a test for expedited qualification 15 of people who've got clear cases. Would you agree 16 with me that the scientific literature says that a 17 diagnosis of asbestosis by pathology is a pretty 18 reliable way of determining, at least those people 19 who have significant fibrosis? 20 A I'm not sure I'd agree with you and -- now, 21 this is on personal experience. Okay? There's no 22 question that the average pathologist will pick up 23 the fibrosis and the interstitial disease. Okay? 24 But the proof of asbestos fibers in the specimen, at 25 least in Spokane, is very wanting and it is in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 Q Yeah. What I'm really getting at is -- and 2 you say you don't take issue, but what I'm really 3 getting at is, you know, maybe -- maybe I haven't 4 been simple and clear enough putting it to you. 5 The criteria of 2/1 ILO or asbestosis by 6 pathological evidence, science says that those are 7 pretty good tests for picking up clear cases of 8 significant fibrosis; would that be fair? 9 A Yeah, I don't have any issue with the 10 fibrosis criteria here. I really don't. 11 Q Okay. 12 A And as I told you, I don't know enough about 13 the dollar amounts that I'm going to make any 14 comments about them. 15 Q I'm not asking you about that at all. 16 Likewise, the TDP for severe asbestosis also 17 calls out a requirement for impaired lung function, 18 correct? 19 A Yes. 20 Q And works with TLC and FVC in doing so, 21 right? 22 A Yeah, the one issue -- 23 Q Let me just get to the question. 24 A Okay. Go ahead. Sorry. 25 Q Would you agree with me that there too, the</p>

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 TDP has tests that science says should pick up people 2 with clear cases? Let me be clear about that. Not 3 suggesting that it will pick up all of them, but the 4 people who qualify under the TDP based upon -- strike 5 that. 6 Would it be fair to say that under the 7 science today, those people who do have impairment 8 meeting the tests of the TDP for severe asbestosis 9 are likely to be people who do have significant 10 impairment? 11 A That's true. And if I could say something 12 relative to this? 13 Q Sure. 14 A It's interesting that TLC is used rather than 15 DLCO. DLCO -- TLC is probably less accurate than 16 DLCO is as far as its consistency of the study. 17 That's one problem that the DLCO is not in there. 18 The second problem with this is that the 19 ratio is greater than 65 percent because it's well 20 known that asbestosis can produce a significant 21 obstructive defect. 22 Q You're answering a different question and I'm 23 glad you did. 24 A Okay. But I -- you know, I said I didn't 25 have much issue with it, but the more I -- I didn't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 A Well, true, except that -- let me give you an 2 example of one that will not, and we run into this 3 periodically. Somebody that has interstitial 4 fibrosis, that is, UIP, usual interstitial 5 pneumonitis, it's non-asbestos related and then we 6 discover they don't have asbestosis because we can't 7 establish an exposure history, and so your point 8 number four there about supporting medical 9 documentation is a very important factor in that, you 10 know. I mean, you have to have documentation of the 11 disease. 12 Q I think you're agreeing with me. 13 If we look at the TDP for severe asbestosis 14 and we ask, do the tests that are set out in that 15 TDP, are those tests tests that science says if 16 they're met by claimants, those claimants are, in 17 fact, likely to have severe asbestosis, is the answer 18 to that question yes? If these tests -- 19 A Well, yes it is. If you read the entire 20 thing, yes, it is. 21 Q So if we read TDP for severe asbestosis in 22 its entirety, that is a TDP which science says will 23 pick up people who are pretty clear cases of severe 24 asbestosis; is that fair? 25 A That's fair.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 have issue with that first part, but I do have issue 2 with the second part. 3 Q Okay. You don't -- you didn't have issue 4 with the first part, you're referring to the tests 5 for fibrosis as set forth in level 4-A, correct? 6 A Right. 7 Q But I'm glad you made the statement that you 8 did because I want to be clear on the focus of my 9 questions, and this is important, Dr. Whitehouse. 10 I'm asking you really not whether you or 11 somebody else could have included other criteria 12 which would have had the effect of picking up more 13 people. I'm not asking you that. 14 I'm asking you whether the criteria as set 15 out, both for fibrosis and for impairment in level 16 4-A, are criteria which if they're met by a claimant, 17 that claimant -- science says that claimant is, in 18 fact, likely to have a pretty clear case of severe 19 asbestosis. In other words, these criteria -- I'm 20 sorry. I'll rephrase. 21 These criteria are criteria that science says 22 will pick up clear cases. You may say they may not 23 pick up all of them, but they'll -- the cases they 24 pick up will be clear cases of severe asbestosis, 25 fair?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Now, it will also not pick up other 2 people who may have severe asbestosis, I take it is 3 what you're saying? 4 A Yes, that's a problem. 5 Q Okay. Well, it may or may not be a problem 6 depending upon what the judge in this case thinks, 7 but you're saying in one of your criticisms of these 8 TDPs is who they exclude, fair? 9 A Fair. 10 Q Okay. And this TDP for severe asbestosis 11 will exclude people outside of Libby, nothing to do 12 with Libby, will exclude people outside of Libby that 13 may have severe asbestosis, fair? 14 A Yes. 15 Q And you're saying it will exclude -- in your 16 own experience, it will exclude people within Libby 17 who have severe asbestosis, correct? 18 A I think it is much more likely in Libby for 19 them to be excluded because of the nature of the 20 disease than it would be outside Libby. 21 Q Well, we're going to get to that in a minute, 22 but both inside and outside of Libby, if these tests 23 for severe asbestosis are met, science says those 24 people will pretty clearly be people with severe 25 asbestosis, correct, in both places?</p>

45 (Pages 174 to 177)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 A I think reasonably, yes.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And by the same token, this test that</p> <p>3 is in the TDP for severe asbestosis will exclude</p> <p>4 people both inside and outside Libby that some might</p> <p>5 say based upon a different test, in fact, have severe</p> <p>6 asbestosis. We're in agreement about that, correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Now, the people outside of Libby who</p> <p>9 are excluded will include people who have low DLCO</p> <p>10 scores, right?</p> <p>11 A Correct.</p> <p>12 Q Will exclude people who are not 2/1s, but</p> <p>13 maybe, you know, 1/1s but has severe impairment.</p> <p>14 There will be borderline cases outside of Libby,</p> <p>15 right?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And with the borderline cases, are you</p> <p>18 familiar that in the trust distribution process,</p> <p>19 they'll have the opportunity for individual review?</p> <p>20 A I understand that.</p> <p>21 Q And you understand the same thing will be</p> <p>22 true with people of Libby?</p> <p>23 A Yes, I think one of the things that really</p> <p>24 disturbs me about that is it's not a physician that's</p> <p>25 reviewing it. It's not a pulmonologist.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 would you agree with me that when it comes to tests</p> <p>2 for the presentation of the disease that science says</p> <p>3 that where people meet that test, it's pretty clear</p> <p>4 that they do have diffuse pleural thickening?</p> <p>5 A How they answer this question is --</p> <p>6 Q It's where the test is met.</p> <p>7 A Well, I think you may be right about that,</p> <p>8 where the test is met.</p> <p>9 Q That's what I'm asking.</p> <p>10 A But the test itself has some severe</p> <p>11 limitations and problems with it.</p> <p>12 Q I'm not really going to debate that with you</p> <p>13 in the questions I'm asking you right now.</p> <p>14 A Okay.</p> <p>15 Q I'm asking you the same kinds of questions</p> <p>16 that I asked you about when it comes to severe</p> <p>17 asbestosis, that is, the tests that are imposed by</p> <p>18 the TDP for severe disabling pleural disease, for the</p> <p>19 diagnosis of it, those are tests that science says if</p> <p>20 they're satisfied, the claimant will be a pretty</p> <p>21 clear case of having severe disabling pleural</p> <p>22 disease, correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q The same thing is true with the impairment</p> <p>25 requirements for level 4-B, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 Q Okay.</p> <p>2 A A pulmonologist is really knowledgeable about</p> <p>3 asbestos. That would make a lot of difference to</p> <p>4 that.</p> <p>5 Q But that's true outside of Libby and it's</p> <p>6 true inside of Libby, correct?</p> <p>7 A It ought to be.</p> <p>8 Q Throughout -- well, I understand that, but</p> <p>9 that criticism that you have of individual review</p> <p>10 applies both outside and inside of Libby, right?</p> <p>11 A Yes, it does, but the same thing that I just</p> <p>12 said about it holds true is that, how can a</p> <p>13 non-physician, somebody that's not really</p> <p>14 knowledgeable about asbestos diseases by having dealt</p> <p>15 with it on a regular basis make that kind of a</p> <p>16 decision.</p> <p>17 Q I want to take a look now at the TDP for</p> <p>18 severe disabling pleural disease level 4-B, and my</p> <p>19 questions are really very much the same, which is</p> <p>20 that this is a TDP that seeks to pick out people with</p> <p>21 severe disabling pleural disease by both of imposing</p> <p>22 a test for the presentation of the disease as well as</p> <p>23 by imposing a test for severity of impairment, fair?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. And when it comes to the diagnosis,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 A Correct.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. So we take a look at the TDP for</p> <p>3 severe disabling pleural disease, is it such that</p> <p>4 science says that where it's met, those will be</p> <p>5 pretty clear cases where people, in fact, have that</p> <p>6 disease, fair?</p> <p>7 A If you concur with the entire body of</p> <p>8 science.</p> <p>9 Q Yes, that is, if we look at the entire body</p> <p>10 of the science, that science --</p> <p>11 A If you agree with that.</p> <p>12 Q Oh, no, I'm just saying -- I'm saying again,</p> <p>13 just like I did with severe asbestosis, that science</p> <p>14 says with -- where these tests, in fact, are met,</p> <p>15 people who satisfy those tests are highly likely --</p> <p>16 are clear cases where they have severe disabling</p> <p>17 pleural disease. Not saying they're the only ones,</p> <p>18 but once they meet the tests are going to be pretty</p> <p>19 clear cases under the science; is that fair?</p> <p>20 A Okay.</p> <p>21 Q Is that -- I don't want an okay. Is that</p> <p>22 right?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. Now, we also know as we went through</p> <p>25 with severe asbestosis that the test for severe</p>

46 (Pages 178 to 181)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 182</p> <p>1 disabling pleural disease level 4-B will, in fact, 2 exclude people outside of Libby who some might say -- 3 doctors might say, in fact, have severe disabling 4 pleural disease, right? 5 A Yes. 6 Q And it will also exclude people within Libby 7 who you would say have severe disabling pleural 8 disease, correct? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And I think what you said this morning is 11 that if you took a look at the McCloud study, the 12 McCloud study relates to people who are outside of 13 Libby, right? 14 A Yes. 15 Q And I think you said that under the McCloud 16 study more than -- more than 50 percent of the people 17 in the McCloud study wouldn't pass the requirements 18 of level 4-B in the TDP, right? 19 A Right. 20 Q When it comes to people within Libby, I think 21 you said that the TDP would have the effect of 22 excluding about the same proportion of people in 23 Libby with severe disabling pleural disease as was 24 reflected in the McCloud study, correct? 25 A Pretty much.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 184</p> <p>1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the 2 record. The time is now 1:15 p.m. This is the end 3 of disk number two in the continuing deposition of 4 Alan Whitehouse. 5 (Pause in the proceedings.) 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the 7 record. The time is now 1:17 p.m. This is the 8 beginning of disk number three in the continuing 9 deposition of Dr. Alan Whitehouse. 10 EXAMINATION (Continuing) 11 BY MR. BERNICK: 12 Q Dr. Whitehouse, if we -- strike that. 13 If DLCO were to be included as an alternative 14 basis for qualifying people for severe disabling 15 pleural disease -- I think you've already recognized 16 in response to Mr. Finch's question -- that if that 17 is the only evidence of impairment of lung function, 18 that is, it's really truly an alternative way for 19 people to qualify, that would have the effect of 20 allowing people to qualify where the cause of the 21 lower DLCO was unrelated to asbestos, correct? 22 A Well, I think that could easily be. 23 Q How? 24 A Well, for several -- several reasons. First 25 off, those people have over-disease (sic). Okay?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 183</p> <p>1 Q Okay. 2 A Close to it. 3 Q So we're talking about roughly the same 4 proportion and effect of the TDP both inside Libby 5 based upon your own experience and outside Libby 6 based upon the McCloud article. Did I get that 7 right? 8 A Yeah, on the basis though or the caveat I 9 would say about this is on the basis of just that 10 aspect. We're not talking about DLCOs or anything 11 else. Just about -- 12 Q Blunting? 13 A Just about blunting. 14 Q Okay. So when it comes to the blunting 15 criteria in level 4-B, that has the same proportion 16 and effect inside Libby as outside Libby, fair? 17 A Very similar. 18 Q Okay. 19 A Very close. 20 Q Now, if we wanted to include -- 21 MR. BERNICK: Why don't you just change 22 it now? 23 So for people outside on the telephone, we 24 have a conspiratorial process here inside the room 25 called changing the tape.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 185</p> <p>1 They have big exposure histories, generally. They 2 may or may not have some small degree of interstitial 3 disease. They're very limited and that can be 4 proven, with the treadmill or with being on oxygen 5 and hypoxic or whatever the case may be, and 6 ordinarily, most of those people have significant 7 abnormalities in their pulmonary function, although 8 they may not be below 65 percent. They're in that 9 range though, some -- frequently. 10 So there's very ample diagnostic evidence 11 that that's the source of it, and then if the CTs 12 were looked at, almost all of those people have some 13 pleural fibrosis that you can't see on x-ray and 14 explains their DLCO and it's clearly asbestos 15 related. 16 Q Yeah, but I'm getting at a different thing. 17 If this expedited review -- that's what the 18 TDP review speaks to -- expedited review where the 19 submission is done on paper and there are written 20 criteria which if met, you're in, and if you don't 21 meet them, you're not in. That's the -- that's the 22 world that we're operating in. 23 If you were to make DLCO an alternative 24 measure for the impairment of lung function such that 25 somebody who didn't meet the requirements based upon</p>

47 (Pages 182 to 185)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 forced vital capacity still could qualify for DLCO, 2 how would you state objective criteria that -- so 3 they could check off that would eliminate the cases 4 where DLCO is reduced for some source, some reason 5 that's not asbestos? How would you do it? 6 A I don't think it would be difficult at all. 7 You'd basically say that there's pleural disease 8 present. Everybody -- that everybody agrees that 9 there's pleural disease present. They have abnormal 10 pulmonary function. I don't think you have to put it 11 with normal pulmonary function in that situation, but 12 you have to recognize that some of those people will 13 be right around 65 percent. 14 You could -- this is the one situation where 15 a CT evidence would help you a great deal and then, 16 say, that there's no other obvious reasons for there 17 to be a reduced DLCO. 18 Q So that's how you would write it? 19 A I'm not sure exactly how I'd write it. Never 20 even thought about that. But, roughly, I could write 21 something that would cover those people and would 22 protect the TDP from people that don't have 23 significant asbestos disease. 24 Q And it would be such that somebody, not a 25 doctor, could review it and say --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 collections of data that are Libby specific and -- 2 are Libby specific and focus on non-malignant disease 3 caused by asbestos. 4 You have the ATSDR data and then you have the 5 CARD Clinic data; is that right? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Now, the ATSDR data, would you agree with me, 8 that ATSDR was an independent organization when they 9 came in to gather that data at Libby? 10 A You know what I'm going to ask probably about 11 the ATSDR. Are you talking about the original 12 Sullivan study? 13 Q I'm talking about the original gathering of 14 the data. I'm not here to talk about authors of 15 studies or anything. I'm talking about data. All 16 the questions I'm going to ask you are all about 17 gathering data. 18 A Oh, okay. 19 Q The ATS -- the data that the ATSDR gathered, 20 that collection of -- you've got two collections of 21 data, CARD Clinic data, ATSDR clinic -- ATSDR data, 22 right? 23 A Yeah. You're talking about the x-ray data 24 from the screening -- 25 Q Yes, the screening --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 A Yeah. 2 Q -- that's right, it's all set? They wouldn't 3 have to read the CT scan? 4 A Just a check off and all, yeah. 5 Q It's not in any of your reports, correct? 6 A What's that? 7 Q That's not in any of your reports, is it? 8 A No, I don't think I've ever put that down on 9 paper. That's the first time anybody's actually 10 asked me that. 11 Q I asked you. 12 A You asked me. I could do it and it would 13 be -- I wouldn't want it to be unfair. I mean, you 14 know, I spent -- this is a digression a little bit, 15 but I spent years doing disability evaluations for 16 the State of Washington and was very successful in it 17 because my track record was one of being right in the 18 middle of the road. You know, I wasn't about to go 19 along with somebody that didn't have it, and so it 20 was pretty even. Now, that's not always the case 21 with IME docs, but that's possible to do that and to 22 write it in such a way that it could be done. 23 Q Let's talk about the Libby data and what the 24 Libby data shows about that. Okay? 25 As I understand it, there are two basic</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 A -- that one? 2 Q -- the screening data. 3 A Right. Okay. 4 Q So when it came to the -- are you aware of 5 any other basic collection of non-malignant data at 6 Libby beyond the ATSDR and the CARD Clinic? 7 A No, only insofar as the radiologist in Libby, 8 Steve Becker, who is a reasonably accurate reader as 9 far -- and was part of that reading with the ATSDR, 10 so I guess you'd have to include him in that. 11 Q Okay. So now the ATSDR data was gathered by 12 people who were independent, correct? 13 A Yes. 14 Q The ATSDR data was gathered pursuant to an 15 established protocol that had to be followed the same 16 way for all people, correct? 17 A I think so, yeah. 18 Q The ATSDR data is all available to 19 constituencies of people in this case, correct? 20 A Yes. 21 Q There are studies that have been published on 22 the ATSDR data, correct? 23 A That's correct. 24 Q And the ATSDR data is -- would you agree, 25 representative of the disease picture or pattern in</p>

48 (Pages 186 to 189)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 Libby?</p> <p>2 A We have to be sure what part of that you're</p> <p>3 talking about and what part of it was published and</p> <p>4 by whom.</p> <p>5 Q Not talking about published, just talking</p> <p>6 about the data.</p> <p>7 The screening data that was gathered, that's</p> <p>8 a representative collection of data when it comes to</p> <p>9 representing the pattern or picture of Libby?</p> <p>10 A At the time it was, yes, I think so.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Now, with respect to the CARD Clinic,</p> <p>12 I want to ask you the same kinds of questions.</p> <p>13 Would you say that the data was gathered for</p> <p>14 the CARD Clinic by people who were in all cases</p> <p>15 independent?</p> <p>16 A What do you mean?</p> <p>17 Q Didn't have any other agenda.</p> <p>18 A I think generally that's true. I think that</p> <p>19 pulmonary function data and chest x-ray data, which</p> <p>20 includes Becker's as well as our readings in there, I</p> <p>21 think was pretty consistent and I don't -- it wasn't</p> <p>22 biased, I don't think.</p> <p>23 Q Well, that's what I'm asking. It wasn't</p> <p>24 biased?</p> <p>25 A Huh-uh. (Answers negatively.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 Q Where is it written?</p> <p>2 A In the -- in the procedure manual for the --</p> <p>3 for the -- for the lab.</p> <p>4 Q For the lab?</p> <p>5 A I don't know where it is, but I know it's up</p> <p>6 there.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. But what about when it comes to taking</p> <p>8 exposure history? Is there a --</p> <p>9 A They don't take the exposure histories. The</p> <p>10 techs don't.</p> <p>11 Q Oh, you mean the CARD Clinic?</p> <p>12 A The other people in the CARD Clinic?</p> <p>13 Q Yeah.</p> <p>14 A Yeah, those are taken both by the --</p> <p>15 Q But is there a written protocol?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, there is for the nurses. There's a</p> <p>17 written protocol.</p> <p>18 Q Do you know, were those ever made available</p> <p>19 publically?</p> <p>20 A I don't know, but I know that there's a</p> <p>21 series of forms that they use concerning that.</p> <p>22 There's both a check list and then things that they</p> <p>23 can add on in handwriting as well, and that's been</p> <p>24 used -- and those are in everybody's chart, and</p> <p>25 they've been used pretty much since the inception of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 Q But when it comes to protocol, there's no</p> <p>2 protocol that was followed by the CARD Clinic in</p> <p>3 gathering the data that is in their files, correct?</p> <p>4 A Well, yes, there actually is because when the</p> <p>5 people came in from screening, they took an interval</p> <p>6 history from them. Some of that was done by nurses.</p> <p>7 A lot of that is in a database now. They had a new</p> <p>8 chest x-ray taken. They had pulmonary function taken</p> <p>9 that the doc saw and there's a dictated note</p> <p>10 concerning the medical care, so --</p> <p>11 Q But that's a --</p> <p>12 A -- it closely all followed the same. There's</p> <p>13 more than one doc, but it was --</p> <p>14 Q Different doctors --</p> <p>15 A -- similar.</p> <p>16 Q -- you know, when it came to the pulmonary</p> <p>17 function test, how it was administered, was there an</p> <p>18 absolute set protocol on how the pulmonary function</p> <p>19 test was to be administered with respect to all</p> <p>20 people who are part of the CARD Clinic data?</p> <p>21 A I think pretty much so. It's pretty much the</p> <p>22 same protocol that I used in my practice for years.</p> <p>23 I trained those people up there.</p> <p>24 Q Is it written?</p> <p>25 A Yeah, certainly.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p> <p>1 the clinic in --</p> <p>2 Q What about --</p> <p>3 A -- 2000.</p> <p>4 Q What about in reading x-rays? Is there one</p> <p>5 protocol that's been followed in reading all x-rays</p> <p>6 at the CARD Clinic?</p> <p>7 A Probably not. They're all read by -- they</p> <p>8 were all read by the radiologist at the hospital.</p> <p>9 Q But different radiologists?</p> <p>10 A No, all the same one, pretty much.</p> <p>11 Q All the same one?</p> <p>12 A Yeah, he occasionally had to cover it, but</p> <p>13 not very much. For a long time, I over-read most of</p> <p>14 the x-rays there --</p> <p>15 Q When you read --</p> <p>16 A -- but not anymore.</p> <p>17 Q I'm sorry.</p> <p>18 When you read the x-rays, you didn't read</p> <p>19 them always according to the ILO classifications?</p> <p>20 A Oh, no, never did.</p> <p>21 Q Well, that's what I'm saying.</p> <p>22 There wasn't one procedure that was followed</p> <p>23 by the radiologist in reading the x-rays, fair?</p> <p>24 A As far as ILO is concerned, no, we didn't use</p> <p>25 ILO at all.</p>

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 194</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And when it comes to how the different</p> <p>2 radiologists read the x-rays, we know that you often</p> <p>3 read the x-rays somewhat differently than Dr. Becker,</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A Not nearly as often as you might think.</p> <p>6 Q I didn't ask you that. I said just --</p> <p>7 A Occasionally.</p> <p>8 Q -- often.</p> <p>9 A Occasionally, I did, yes.</p> <p>10 Q In fact, you had some critical things to say</p> <p>11 about Dr. Becker's readings?</p> <p>12 A I did early on, not -- not recently.</p> <p>13 Q But that wouldn't -- that would still affect</p> <p>14 the data that the CARD Clinic has, that is, you don't</p> <p>15 have the same degree of uniformity in the data from</p> <p>16 the CARD Clinic as you do in the data from the ATSDR,</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 A Oh, I think -- I think we've got very good</p> <p>19 data.</p> <p>20 Q Didn't say that.</p> <p>21 It's not as consistent. If you're looking</p> <p>22 for consistency, it's not as consistent as ATSDR,</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 MR. LEWIS: I'm going -- I'm going to</p> <p>25 object as to the word consistent because that -- that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 196</p> <p>1 problem is that there's this huge database that</p> <p>2 they've been putting stuff into and nobody that's</p> <p>3 able to extract it out.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. Well, that's really what I'm kind of</p> <p>5 getting at.</p> <p>6 In this case what we have seen out of the</p> <p>7 CARD Clinic is --</p> <p>8 MR. BERNICK: Is that the 850 or the</p> <p>9 950?</p> <p>10 MR. FINCH: It's the 950, plus a</p> <p>11 handful of other people. It's on Exhibit-2-A.</p> <p>12 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So when it comes to the</p> <p>13 data from the CARD Clinic, certainly, parties to this</p> <p>14 case do not have all of the data from the CARD</p> <p>15 Clinic, indeed, a huge portion of the data from the</p> <p>16 CARD Clinic is not available in this case, correct?</p> <p>17 A I think that's probably true, yeah. It</p> <p>18 hasn't been as yet.</p> <p>19 Q And certainly there --</p> <p>20 A You do have all the charts now, right? Yeah,</p> <p>21 you've got every one of them at one time or another</p> <p>22 from my understanding is that -- that there was some</p> <p>23 significant problems in mislabeling and that you</p> <p>24 didn't know what you had for a while because the</p> <p>25 numbers were mislabeled, but you at one point had</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 195</p> <p>1 is a very vague term. I think your prior question I</p> <p>2 wouldn't object to, but you're talking -- go ahead.</p> <p>3 A Well, the ATSDR was running the Masa* Clinic</p> <p>4 which is the Montana -- the money that came through</p> <p>5 the State of Montana couldn't come directly to it,</p> <p>6 and they were running that for quite a while and they</p> <p>7 had a variety of people that were working there, one</p> <p>8 of whom we know was, you know, just -- I don't know</p> <p>9 how to put it, but I know darn well we didn't get</p> <p>10 good data from that person at all and that went into</p> <p>11 the database, I'm sure, and ATSDR's database.</p> <p>12 But almost all the stuff that's in the charts</p> <p>13 that's been filtered by a number of people to get --</p> <p>14 make sure that we have accuracy, and in that sense,</p> <p>15 it's pretty much a consistent protocol for doing</p> <p>16 everything. Probably better than most any clinic</p> <p>17 that you'd see.</p> <p>18 Q (By Mr. Bernick) When it comes to the</p> <p>19 availability of information from the CARD Clinic, I</p> <p>20 think you would agree that almost half of the medical</p> <p>21 information with respect to people who have been seen</p> <p>22 at the CARD Clinic is, in fact, not available</p> <p>23 publically or to the people in this case, correct?</p> <p>24 A Well, right now -- well, it is available now.</p> <p>25 I mean, everything is pretty much available. The</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p> <p>1 copies of all the 950 people.</p> <p>2 Q I'm not talking about the 950. I'm talking</p> <p>3 about the 1,800. Let's be clear.</p> <p>4 The CARD Clinic data goes way beyond the 900,</p> <p>5 950, correct?</p> <p>6 A That's true.</p> <p>7 Q And all that's been made available in this</p> <p>8 case is the 950 or thereabouts, correct?</p> <p>9 A And that's basically all I've been talking</p> <p>10 about is those 950.</p> <p>11 Q Well, again, I'm just establishing,</p> <p>12 Dr. Whitehouse, that in contrast to the ATSDR data</p> <p>13 which is all available with respect to the CARD</p> <p>14 Clinic, almost half the data is not available in this</p> <p>15 case, correct?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, and that's true, and basically the</p> <p>17 reasons for it is HIPAA laws.</p> <p>18 Q I didn't --</p> <p>19 A Well, they're the HIPAA laws.</p> <p>20 Q Well, I'm not blaming you for --</p> <p>21 (Simultaneous talking.)</p> <p>22 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I'm not blaming you for it.</p> <p>23 I'm just saying it's --</p> <p>24 A Oh, it's not my fault anyway regardless.</p> <p>25 Q Right. It's a fact that it's not available</p>

50 (Pages 194 to 197)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 in this case, correct?</p> <p>2 A But I think that you have to realize that we</p> <p>3 are under the constraints of the HIPAA laws, probably</p> <p>4 more than most people are because we are a clinic</p> <p>5 that's in many respects federally funded or is</p> <p>6 getting to be federally funded, so --</p> <p>7 Q Which you'd also agree --</p> <p>8 A -- there's a great deal of care about that.</p> <p>9 Q Would you also agree with me that there are</p> <p>10 no studies with respect -- published studies with</p> <p>11 respect to the 1,800 patients diagnosed in the CARD</p> <p>12 Clinic?</p> <p>13 A There are not.</p> <p>14 Q Would you also agree with me that you don't</p> <p>15 know -- strike that.</p> <p>16 When it comes to the CARD Clinic data, you've</p> <p>17 made reference to all these databases. How many</p> <p>18 databases are maintained at the CARD Clinic with</p> <p>19 respect to people who would have been diagnosed with</p> <p>20 asbestos-related illness?</p> <p>21 A It's basically two, the chart and then there</p> <p>22 is a database that the EPA has put together which</p> <p>23 data has been entered into for about the last year</p> <p>24 and a half including back data, and my understanding</p> <p>25 is that they are now caught up with everybody in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 Are there any electronic databases containing</p> <p>2 the CARD Clinic data?</p> <p>3 A There is, concerning all the patients.</p> <p>4 Q Concerning all the patients?</p> <p>5 A To my knowledge.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And who -- and who -- is that the one</p> <p>7 the EPA has done?</p> <p>8 A Well, the EPA set it up, but it's now our</p> <p>9 database.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And that database includes all the</p> <p>11 people who have come through the CARD Clinic ever or</p> <p>12 just the people that have come through the CARD</p> <p>13 Clinic in the last eighteen months?</p> <p>14 A It should, to my knowledge, include everybody</p> <p>15 including the people that are normal.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Does it include all the people who</p> <p>17 have ever come through the CARD Clinic, the</p> <p>18 historical patients?</p> <p>19 A I think so.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Does --</p> <p>21 A I can't answer your question.</p> <p>22 Q Does it include all the information that's in</p> <p>23 the charts?</p> <p>24 A I hope it does.</p> <p>25 Q So it literally is supposed to be everything?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 there they're entering.</p> <p>2 Q What's the difference between the two</p> <p>3 databases?</p> <p>4 A Well, the chart is all right there, x-ray</p> <p>5 reports, things like that. It hasn't been put into a</p> <p>6 database. What they do is they use that, plus the</p> <p>7 patient interview and then put into the database when</p> <p>8 the patient comes in.</p> <p>9 Q So we have two databases?</p> <p>10 A Well, you asked me about a database. It's a</p> <p>11 database. It's not organized in a computer or</p> <p>12 anything, but that's where the data is.</p> <p>13 Q Okay.</p> <p>14 A So it's in the charts.</p> <p>15 Q But I misunderstood.</p> <p>16 So you have all the charts?</p> <p>17 A I have all the charts.</p> <p>18 Q And those are paper records for everybody</p> <p>19 who's come through CARD?</p> <p>20 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>21 Q You have to respond orally.</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. When I ask about databases, I'm</p> <p>24 talking about compilations or collections of</p> <p>25 information electronically.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 201</p> <p>1 A It's literally supposed to be all the</p> <p>2 pertinent data and there's some other stuff in there</p> <p>3 like social studies and things like that that may not</p> <p>4 be in there, but for all the pertinent data</p> <p>5 concerning their asbestosis, it's in there.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Do you have access to this database?</p> <p>7 A Probably.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Who else has access to the database?</p> <p>9 A I would guess Brad Black* and I know Steve</p> <p>10 Levine* knows it, Mount Sinai, who's one of the</p> <p>11 people who's out there fairly frequently, and several</p> <p>12 of the nurses would have access to it.</p> <p>13 Nobody -- to explain this. Nobody has done</p> <p>14 anything about this because we haven't even had -- we</p> <p>15 barely have enough money to keep that place open much</p> <p>16 less spend a lot of time with people doing database,</p> <p>17 so we will have it because we just got some pretty</p> <p>18 decent sized grants that will allow us to do that,</p> <p>19 but you have to realize that we were dependent on</p> <p>20 Grace for money to keep that place running and Grace</p> <p>21 wasn't providing it.</p> <p>22 Q So have you -- strike that.</p> <p>23 Have you had access to that database for</p> <p>24 anything that you've done in connection with this</p> <p>25 case?</p>

51 (Pages 198 to 201)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 202</p> <p>1 A Would I?</p> <p>2 Q Have you.</p> <p>3 A Have I? I have not accessed it. I assume</p> <p>4 that I can.</p> <p>5 Q What about Dr. Frank?</p> <p>6 A No, probably not because he's not really a</p> <p>7 member of the CARD staff which I am, of course.</p> <p>8 Q And certainly that database has not been</p> <p>9 available -- the electronic database has not been</p> <p>10 made available to the parties in this case, correct?</p> <p>11 A I don't think it's been used except to</p> <p>12 collect the data for the present time.</p> <p>13 Q Well --</p> <p>14 A But I think it's up to date and I think it's</p> <p>15 got a lot of data in it, but I don't know when it's</p> <p>16 going to be accessed. Probably in the next year when</p> <p>17 the EPA -- when it comes in.</p> <p>18 Q If there were -- if there is a unique form of</p> <p>19 diffuse pleural thickening that's evident in people</p> <p>20 in Libby, should we be able to see it if we study the</p> <p>21 ATSDR screening data?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q Just not apparent at all?</p> <p>24 A Won't be apparent unless you follow people</p> <p>25 longitudinally and you have physician input, but</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 204</p> <p>1 each one of those layers and peel it off and</p> <p>2 distinguish it.</p> <p>3 So let's begin -- recognizing what you just</p> <p>4 said, let's begin with how diffuse pleural</p> <p>5 thickening, severe diffuse pleural thickening --</p> <p>6 that's the only kind of pleural thickening I want to</p> <p>7 talk about -- severe diffuse pleural disease. Let's</p> <p>8 talk about how it presents itself --</p> <p>9 A Okay.</p> <p>10 Q -- in Libby, and I want -- what I want to</p> <p>11 know is: In the objective presentation of severe</p> <p>12 diffuse pleural thickening at Libby, tell me whether</p> <p>13 and how it is different from diffuse pleural</p> <p>14 thickening, severe, outside of Libby.</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Object to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 A Rarely had I ever seen diffuse severe pleural</p> <p>18 thickening outside of Libby. I know it's described.</p> <p>19 People have seen it. It's been reported. Pleural</p> <p>20 deaths have been reported.</p> <p>21 As I mentioned before, the rapidity of its</p> <p>22 progression as part of it, that's clear to me, and</p> <p>23 progression on to death which is rarely ever</p> <p>24 described and we've had a number of those, and then</p> <p>25 the other factor, I think, that we haven't even</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 203</p> <p>1 there's no physician input to the ATSDR screening.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Likewise, if we look at the CARD</p> <p>3 information, would you say that there's no way to see</p> <p>4 any unique form of diffuse pleural thickening at</p> <p>5 Libby unless you have access to the details of the</p> <p>6 charts?</p> <p>7 A Well, first off, I object to your term unique</p> <p>8 which is something that Grace has managed to --</p> <p>9 Q Well, I'll withdraw the -- I'll withdraw.</p> <p>10 A Let's leave that word out of it because it's</p> <p>11 not unique.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Well, then let me -- that's fair. Let</p> <p>13 me then ask you the question.</p> <p>14 Dr. Frank has told us under oath that he does</p> <p>15 not believe that there is a different disease or a</p> <p>16 special disease or form of disease, pleural disease</p> <p>17 in Libby. It's just the same disease. Would you</p> <p>18 agree with that?</p> <p>19 A Well, I would agree that it's basically the</p> <p>20 same disease that has been occasionally seen in</p> <p>21 chrysotile, but the frequency of it and the</p> <p>22 predominance of it and the progression of it to death</p> <p>23 is different.</p> <p>24 Q And we're going to pursue that, but I want to</p> <p>25 peel this off layer by layer. We're going to take</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 205</p> <p>1 discussed is the fact that a number of people have</p> <p>2 extremely severe functional abnormalities in</p> <p>3 pulmonary function, but pleural thickening is not</p> <p>4 that thick, and that basically it's two to three</p> <p>5 millimeters in thickness, but is everywhere and</p> <p>6 results in incredibly severe physiologic</p> <p>7 consequences. That's one of the things we saw in</p> <p>8 that mortality study is people that died from that,</p> <p>9 of pleural thickening, so I don't know if that</p> <p>10 answers your question now, but --</p> <p>11 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Yeah, it does.</p> <p>12 A -- those are the differences.</p> <p>13 Q It does. That's fine.</p> <p>14 When you think about how the Libby pleural</p> <p>15 disease, severe pleural disease is different, those</p> <p>16 are the three things that you would recite: The fact</p> <p>17 of the rapidity of progression, progression to death,</p> <p>18 and the fact that in some cases the pleural thickness</p> <p>19 is not as pronounced as you would see outside of</p> <p>20 Libby?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Now, of all of those, we're going to</p> <p>23 take -- we'll just take them separately, so I want to</p> <p>24 put to one side now rapidity of progression and</p> <p>25 progression to death and just talk about the one that</p>

52 (Pages 202 to 205)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 206</p> <p>1 you've identified which says you can have severe 2 pleural disease at Libby without that much thickness, 3 but -- without that much thickening of the pleura. 4 A Yes. 5 Q That is a difference that you point to that 6 would say the disease in Libby presents itself 7 somewhat differently in that respect from the disease 8 outside of Libby, fair? 9 A Yes. 10 Q That's really what I want to talk about. 11 First issue is: Is the disease presenting 12 itself differently inside and outside Libby, and the 13 one thing you've identified is that inside Libby 14 people with increased thickness but not that much can 15 still have severe impairment, fair? 16 A That's fair, but there's one other thing I 17 didn't -- I didn't say in that and I probably should 18 have and that is preponderance of what we see is 19 pleural disease with much, much less interstitial 20 disease. 21 Q Well, I -- 22 A And that's a real difference from what -- 23 what's seen in chrysotile disease. 24 Q No, no. I'm talking about the presentation 25 of the pleural disease, not the interstitial disease,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 208</p> <p>1 pleural thickening, severe diffuse pleural thickening 2 outside of Libby contains no reference to whether 3 there's interstitial fibrosis, correct? 4 A It may, yes. 5 Q No, it doesn't may. 6 Can you tell me of anybody who's defined 7 diffuse pleural thickening outside of Libby who 8 includes in that definition interstitial fibrosis? 9 A Oh, in the definition or -- 10 Q Okay. 11 A -- in the observation of the patient? 12 Q I didn't -- 13 A The definition of diffuse pleural 14 thickening -- 15 (Simultaneous talking.) 16 Q (By Mr. Bernick) The definition of diffuse 17 pleural thickening in patients outside of Libby makes 18 no reference -- 19 A No, it doesn't include -- no, it doesn't 20 include interstitial disease. No, it wouldn't. 21 There's no reason why it would. 22 Q Right. 23 And the definition of diffuse pleural 24 thickening inside of Libby, the one that you like, 25 doesn't include interstitial involvement, correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 207</p> <p>1 the pleural disease. 2 A Okay. Well, you're -- in a sense though, 3 you're asking me about the differences that Libby has 4 and that's one of the differences. 5 Q Well, but if somebody has diffuse pleural 6 thickening, severe diffuse pleural thickening outside 7 of Libby, they can have that with or without 8 interstitial involvement at all? 9 A That's true except it is much less common 10 than it is at Libby. 11 Q But that -- 12 A That's not the point. 13 Q -- has nothing to do with the presentation. 14 A What's that? 15 Q That is to say, for somebody who has diffuse 16 pleural thickening outside of Libby, there are 17 characteristics of the thickening of the pleural, you 18 know, blunting of the angle, et cetera, including 19 impairment, there's a presentation that it has 20 diffuse pleural thickening as defined outside of 21 Libby without reference to interstitial involvement, 22 correct? 23 A Yeah, it is uncommon, but, yes. 24 Q Well, but, no. The description -- any 25 definition, any established definition of diffuse</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 209</p> <p>1 A No. 2 Q Am I right about that? 3 A That's right. 4 Q Okay. So if we're comparing diffuse pleural 5 thickening inside/outside Libby in its presentation 6 for diagnostic purposes, your only observation of the 7 difference is that outside of Libby, there's a 8 greater thickness in the pleural that's reported, 9 inside of Libby, you've observed severe diffuse 10 pleural thickening without that much thickening in 11 the pleura, fair? 12 A That's true, but there's -- you know, you 13 can't consider that by itself. There's another 14 aspect to this that we haven't even talked about, 15 exposure history. We're talking about people with 16 fairly severe pleural thickening or -- 17 Q I'm talking -- 18 (Simultaneous talking.) 19 Q (By Mr. Bernick) That's why we really have 20 to peel this thing. I'm trying to be very systematic 21 about it. Okay? I'm talking about the presentation 22 when there's a diagnosis done based upon a 23 presentation. 24 A That's part of it. See, the presentation 25 that we see in the clinic includes the most important</p>

53 (Pages 206 to 209)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 aspects of it or the hallmarks of a diagnosis of 2 asbestos disease. The exposure history. Okay? The 3 physical exam. What the x-ray looks like. What the 4 pulmonary functions look like. Those are all 5 important -- 6 Q All I'm -- 7 (Simultaneous talking.) 8 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay. In the presentation, 9 now you've identified that you can have severe 10 pleural disease with not so much thickness in the 11 pleura. That's one thing -- 12 A Right. 13 Q -- that you would distinguish, right? 14 A Right. 15 Q And now you're saying another thing you would 16 distinguish in the presentation is that the exposures 17 in Libby associated with diffuse pleural disease are 18 less? 19 A As best we can tell, they can be very low 20 exposures and still result in severe pleural disease. 21 Q Do we now have the difference in presentation 22 in severe pleural disease at Libby versus outside, 23 that is, thickness and history of exposure? 24 A Those are two that are important, yes. 25 Q Well, I just want to know. Is there -- this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 Q That's exactly what you said of McCloud. 2 That's why they were the same. 3 A Oh, no, McCloud was referring to the fact 4 that in his study that he did of diffuse pleural 5 thickening, you're right about that in the sense that 6 only 50 percent had pleural thickening. There's 7 other studies since then that have shown more. 8 McCloud has demonstrated that you can have 9 diffuse pleural thickening like we have without much 10 in the way of blunting. What the -- 11 Q And impairment -- 12 A -- TDP is saying and what the 2004 and the 13 ILO is saying, that no, no -- 14 Q No, no, no. 15 A -- diffuse pleural thickening doesn't exist 16 unless there's a blunted angle. 17 Q You're -- we're -- 18 A That's a very -- 19 Q -- again meandering from -- 20 A -- big difference. I'm not meandering. That 21 cuts to -- 22 Q Dr. Whitehouse, let's go back -- 23 A -- the heart of the matter. 24 Q That's fine. We'll go back to question and 25 answer.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 is your opportunity. I want to be totally fair with 2 you. I'm going to go through these very carefully. 3 A Well, let's go -- let's go on further then. 4 The other thing is that a large majority of people 5 that have diffuse pleural thickening do not have 6 blunting -- 7 Q I didn't -- 8 A -- of the costophrenic angle. That's a 9 difference in the presentation also. 10 Q Well, no, but -- no, because you have people 11 with diffuse -- lots of people with diffuse pleural 12 thickening outside of Libby without blunting of the 13 costophrenic angle. We just established that. 14 A Not to that extent. 15 Q Well, and the fact that you told me they're 16 exactly the same proportion outside and inside of 17 Libby. 18 A No, I didn't give you -- you didn't hear me 19 say that. We were talking about the fact -- no, you 20 didn't hear me say that. You misunderstood what I 21 said or I misspoke, one or the other. 22 The presence of -- we have -- approximately 23 half of our people with diffuse pleural thickening 24 that have severe impairment do not have blunting of 25 the costophrenic angle.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 The gentleman over here is not going to be 2 able to verify what -- 3 A Yeah, I'm not asking him to verify anything 4 at all. 5 Q Well, no, you're looking over there like 6 there's going to be some kind of wisdom, as there 7 always is from that side of the room. 8 MR. LEWIS: Now, Counsel, just wait a 9 second. That's out of line. The doctor glanced at 10 me. He's not glanced at me at any other time during 11 this deposition. 12 MR. BERNICK: I know. That's why -- 13 MR. LEWIS: You're reading something 14 into that. 15 MR. BERNICK: That's why it was 16 notable. 17 MR. LEWIS: And putting it on the 18 record, that's totally improper. Why don't you just 19 ask your questions and he'll answer them. Okay? 20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Dr. Whitehouse -- 21 MR. LEWIS: You don't need to comment 22 on this side of the table or anything. 23 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Dr. -- 24 MR. LEWIS: We've got everything on 25 video, so just do your job.</p>

54 (Pages 210 to 213)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 MR. BERNICK: Thank you. Are you done?</p> <p>2 Done? Okay.</p> <p>3 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Dr. Whitehouse,</p> <p>4 presentation, you say that severe pleural -- diffuse</p> <p>5 pleural thickening at Libby differs in presentation</p> <p>6 in that you have people who are -- have got severe</p> <p>7 pleural thickening even though the thickness of the</p> <p>8 pleura is not as pronounced as it would be outside of</p> <p>9 Libby?</p> <p>10 A They have severe physiologic impairment even</p> <p>11 though the thickness of the pleura is less than you</p> <p>12 might expect but is diffuse --</p> <p>13 Q Okay.</p> <p>14 A -- is what I said.</p> <p>15 Q And another thing you said was different in</p> <p>16 presentation is that they have lower exposure than</p> <p>17 people outside of Libby?</p> <p>18 A As best we can tell, that's true.</p> <p>19 Q And then you further said that the</p> <p>20 frequent -- the proportion of the people who do not</p> <p>21 have blunting of the costophrenic angle is greater?</p> <p>22 A Yeah, it's greater than what is being</p> <p>23 required by the TDP. This is requiring 100 percent</p> <p>24 to call it diffuse pleural thickening, and what we're</p> <p>25 saying is it exists without that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 this is not just, okay, here's what -- I'm going to</p> <p>2 ask you for the data and the analysis that drives</p> <p>3 every single one of these things. That's where I'm</p> <p>4 going. Okay?</p> <p>5 So when it comes purely to presentation, you</p> <p>6 tell me the people, the individual people that you</p> <p>7 have diagnosed or that you have seen the diagnosis of</p> <p>8 at Libby who present with severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>9 thickening, but have a lesser thickness in the pleura</p> <p>10 than what you have seen -- what has been seen outside</p> <p>11 of Libby.</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: I object to the form of --</p> <p>13 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Who are those people?</p> <p>14 MR. LEWIS: I object to the form of the</p> <p>15 question. I object to assuming facts not in</p> <p>16 evidence. I object to the compound nature of the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay. I want to know who</p> <p>19 those people are.</p> <p>20 A I can't give you the names right off the top</p> <p>21 of my head. I could give you the mortality study.</p> <p>22 Q No, no, I don't want that.</p> <p>23 A Those people are in that study.</p> <p>24 Q I want to know --</p> <p>25 MR. LEWIS: Object. Object to you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 Q I understand that, but that's not my issue.</p> <p>2 My issue -- my question is not directed at the TDP.</p> <p>3 It's directed at the presentation of the disease.</p> <p>4 When it comes to the presentation of the</p> <p>5 disease, you say the disease presents itself</p> <p>6 differently at Libby and outside of Libby when it</p> <p>7 comes to the thickness of the -- the thickening --</p> <p>8 extent of the thickening, less exposure at Libby, and</p> <p>9 lower frequency of blunting of the costophrenic</p> <p>10 angle?</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Compound.</p> <p>12 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Did I get that list right?</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: And object to the form.</p> <p>14 A What's that?</p> <p>15 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Did I get the list right?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, that is amongst some other things.</p> <p>17 Q No, no, no. You keep on going amongst some</p> <p>18 other things. This is not -- this is not a question,</p> <p>19 Dr. Whitehouse, I'm just asking you -- you've been</p> <p>20 involved in this for a long time and I'm giving you</p> <p>21 the latitude -- and none of this is in your report.</p> <p>22 I'm giving you the latitude, so --</p> <p>23 A It is in the report.</p> <p>24 Q -- I'm asking you -- and I'm going to ask now</p> <p>25 for the underpinning for each one of these things, so</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 arguing with the witness. Just ask your questions.</p> <p>2 Don't stop him in the middle of his answer and say</p> <p>3 no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. That's not a proper</p> <p>4 function.</p> <p>5 MR. BERNICK: You're just making it</p> <p>6 worse.</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: I'm not making it worse.</p> <p>8 MR. BERNICK: Yes, you are.</p> <p>9 MR. LEWIS: I just want you to ask a</p> <p>10 question of the witness without making some</p> <p>11 preparatory --</p> <p>12 MR. BERNICK: We're at the point --</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: -- statement.</p> <p>14 Q (By Mr. Bernick) We're at the point,</p> <p>15 Dr. Whitehouse, and, Counsel, where it's now time to</p> <p>16 find out the data that drives the opinion. That's</p> <p>17 what I'm doing.</p> <p>18 MR. LEWIS: Just ask your question.</p> <p>19 MR. BERNICK: I'm going to ask --</p> <p>20 I'm -- I'm -- just --</p> <p>21 MR. LEWIS: Just ask your question.</p> <p>22 MR. BERNICK: Cool down.</p> <p>23 MR. LEWIS: I'm calm.</p> <p>24 MR. BERNICK: No, you're not. You're</p> <p>25 popping up and down all over the place.</p>

55 (Pages 214 to 217)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 218</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: Counsel --</p> <p>2 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Dr. --</p> <p>3 MR. LEWIS: Counsel, that's enough of</p> <p>4 that. If you keep doing stuff like that, you know --</p> <p>5 MR. BERNICK: It's true though. You've</p> <p>6 just got to keep your seat.</p> <p>7 MR. LEWIS: I haven't left my seat.</p> <p>8 Okay?</p> <p>9 MR. BERNICK: Yeah.</p> <p>10 Q (By Mr. Bernick) And so, Dr. Whitehouse --</p> <p>11 MR. LEWIS: Wait a second. Wait a</p> <p>12 second.</p> <p>13 MR. BERNICK: You're going to prevent</p> <p>14 me from asking the question now?</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Well, just -- I just want</p> <p>16 you to ask questions and stop making comments on what</p> <p>17 everybody is doing in the room. Just do your job and</p> <p>18 ask your questions and don't make speeches in each of</p> <p>19 your questions.</p> <p>20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Dr. Whitehouse, I want you</p> <p>21 to identify to me the specific patients in some</p> <p>22 fashion by reference to some document, some piece of</p> <p>23 paper, the specific patients who you say at Libby had</p> <p>24 presented with severe diffuse pleural thickening even</p> <p>25 though the thickness of their pleura is less than</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 220</p> <p>1 the basis is.</p> <p>2 So you've offered an opinion that says the</p> <p>3 people that you've seen at Libby with severe diffuse</p> <p>4 pleural thickening are different because they have</p> <p>5 thin -- thinner pleuras, right?</p> <p>6 A That's part of it.</p> <p>7 Q That's --</p> <p>8 A That's only one.</p> <p>9 Q That's the first one.</p> <p>10 And so I now want to know the data, the</p> <p>11 specific data that you're referring to, and as I</p> <p>12 understand it, that data is within the medical</p> <p>13 histories of some of the 79; is that fair?</p> <p>14 A It's also on that sheet that was the summary</p> <p>15 sheet that you have. There's one in your exhibits.</p> <p>16 Q The data -- the data that shows the thinness</p> <p>17 is with respect to some group within the 79; is that</p> <p>18 right?</p> <p>19 A That sheet has on it the number of people</p> <p>20 that have that kind of pleural thickening on it.</p> <p>21 Q No, that sheet --</p> <p>22 A They're already separated out.</p> <p>23 Q The counting sheet, no. The counting sheet</p> <p>24 is just a counting sheet. It doesn't tell me who</p> <p>25 those people are.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 219</p> <p>1 what has been reported in the literature outside of</p> <p>2 Libby.</p> <p>3 A I have in that -- now, you're going to have</p> <p>4 to listen to this. Okay? I have --</p> <p>5 Q As long as the response -- as long as you</p> <p>6 answer the question, I'll be happy to listen.</p> <p>7 A I can't give you a name off the top of my</p> <p>8 head. I've got 79 patients in there, some of whom</p> <p>9 may have thin pleural thickening, some of whom -- or</p> <p>10 half of whom don't have blunted angles, and I'd have</p> <p>11 to go through every single one of those charts in</p> <p>12 order to define which one of those are because I</p> <p>13 don't have it defined in the cheat sheets that I've</p> <p>14 got with me here.</p> <p>15 They have numbers on them. I have patients'</p> <p>16 names of all those people, plus I have initials for</p> <p>17 the ones that are protected because they're not --</p> <p>18 you know, they're not people that are claimants, but</p> <p>19 I can't go give you a single name out of there.</p> <p>20 There's no way I can do that. That's an unreasonable</p> <p>21 request.</p> <p>22 Q Dr. Whitehouse, with due respect, that's not</p> <p>23 something that you're going to be deciding. The</p> <p>24 judge is going to decide it. All I -- I have one job</p> <p>25 which is to find out what your opinions are and what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 221</p> <p>1 A There's no way I can tell you here today.</p> <p>2 Okay?</p> <p>3 Q Let's be clear --</p> <p>4 A You give me the chart --</p> <p>5 Q Just -- Dr. Whitehouse --</p> <p>6 A -- and I'll tell you which ones they are.</p> <p>7 Q Just -- just take it a step at a time. I</p> <p>8 want to do this very systematically.</p> <p>9 We're on the point of the difference in</p> <p>10 presentation that has to do with thinness. That was</p> <p>11 one of your comments. The source of your data, your</p> <p>12 data to support that comes from patient histories,</p> <p>13 fair?</p> <p>14 A True.</p> <p>15 Q And particular patient histories that are the</p> <p>16 source of that opinion that show that data, the</p> <p>17 particular patient histories are within the 79 people</p> <p>18 that you have grouped within the mortality study,</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A You -- you have --</p> <p>21 Q Could you just answer that question?</p> <p>22 A No, I'm going to answer your --</p> <p>23 Q Don't --</p> <p>24 A No, you're going to let me finish my question</p> <p>25 (sic) here.</p>

56 (Pages 218 to 221)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 Q No, no, no.</p> <p>2 A Yes, you are right now.</p> <p>3 Q No.</p> <p>4 A You're going to let me --</p> <p>5 MR. LEWIS: Dr. Whitehouse, let -- can</p> <p>6 we take a break?</p> <p>7 MR. BERNICK: You can absolutely take a</p> <p>8 break.</p> <p>9 MR. LEWIS: He's going to ask the same</p> <p>10 question when he comes back, but let's just take a</p> <p>11 break and cool down here. I think it'd be a good --</p> <p>12 MR. BERNICK: Sure.</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: -- thing to do.</p> <p>14 MR. BERNICK: Good.</p> <p>15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the</p> <p>16 record. The time is now 1:56 p.m.</p> <p>17 (Recess.)</p> <p>18 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the</p> <p>19 record. The time is now 2:02 p.m.</p> <p>20 EXAMINATION (Continuing)</p> <p>21 BY MR. BERNICK:</p> <p>22 Q So, Dr. Whitehouse, we're on the first</p> <p>23 difference that you've pointed out in the</p> <p>24 presentation of severe diffuse pleural thickening in</p> <p>25 Libby versus elsewhere which is the thinness of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 Q Are they the same people?</p> <p>2 A Some of them are or not really because most</p> <p>3 of those are dead that are in the mortality study.</p> <p>4 Obviously, they've been dead over the last eight or</p> <p>5 ten years, but a lot of it also comes from patients</p> <p>6 that I see on a regular basis.</p> <p>7 Q Which patients?</p> <p>8 A You know, when you're in private practice and</p> <p>9 you have a large body of --</p> <p>10 Q Dr. Whitehouse --</p> <p>11 A -- patients --</p> <p>12 Q With due respect --</p> <p>13 A -- that's where you get your information.</p> <p>14 Q With due respect, I'm just asking a factual</p> <p>15 question. You don't have to give me any explanation</p> <p>16 about what your practice is like or anything. It may</p> <p>17 or may not be relevant. I'm interested in where the</p> <p>18 data comes from. You've now told me that there's</p> <p>19 data from people in the mortality study, the 79,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you've now also told me that this</p> <p>23 particular difference has been noted in your practice</p> <p>24 in people who are not in the mortality study,</p> <p>25 correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 pleura where people still are -- have severe</p> <p>2 impairment, and I asked you the data, the source</p> <p>3 material that you have when you say that that</p> <p>4 difference has been observed at Libby.</p> <p>5 A You actually have the data. You were given</p> <p>6 yellow spreadsheets, a very large spreadsheet that's</p> <p>7 about six pages taped together which has on it all</p> <p>8 the measurement data of the pleura and the extent of</p> <p>9 the data for every one of the people that died in the</p> <p>10 mortality study.</p> <p>11 Q Well, that's -- that may or may not -- I</p> <p>12 honestly don't know, Dr. Whitehouse.</p> <p>13 A Yeah, you were given it.</p> <p>14 Q Well --</p> <p>15 A I asked that specifically of the attorneys</p> <p>16 before this deposition to make sure that you did have</p> <p>17 that.</p> <p>18 Q My question to you is: I'm assuming then</p> <p>19 that the data that you're now saying supports your</p> <p>20 opinion comes from the mortality study; is that</p> <p>21 correct?</p> <p>22 A Well, that's the numbers that we've actually</p> <p>23 measured, although it also comes from my experience</p> <p>24 with dealing with all these people in the clinic with</p> <p>25 all these people in the clinic.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 A People that are still alive.</p> <p>2 Q Right.</p> <p>3 And so if I want the data, I need to know who</p> <p>4 those people are.</p> <p>5 A I cannot identify those people. You can</p> <p>6 identify the ones in the mortality study which all</p> <p>7 have measurements very readily because you do have</p> <p>8 all that data.</p> <p>9 Q Now, let's talk about the people who are in</p> <p>10 the mortality study that you just had reference to.</p> <p>11 The people in the mortality study, I need to</p> <p>12 know which ones of the people in the mortality study</p> <p>13 you particularly look to in saying that people in the</p> <p>14 mortality study show severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>15 thickening with less than the thickness that's</p> <p>16 observed in the literature. You need to tell me who</p> <p>17 those are. I don't know who you would consider to</p> <p>18 have a thin -- thinner pleura than what's reported in</p> <p>19 the literature and I don't -- hang on -- and I don't</p> <p>20 know which ones of those people you say are also</p> <p>21 severely impaired, so I need to know who they are.</p> <p>22 Who are they?</p> <p>23 A I cannot provide that data to you except on</p> <p>24 those spreadsheets that were provided to you that</p> <p>25 were supposedly going to be brought to this</p>

57 (Pages 222 to 225)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 deposition.</p> <p>2 MR. BERNICK: Are you aware of --</p> <p>3 MR. LEWIS: Yeah, we gave them to you</p> <p>4 at the start of this deposition. You weren't here,</p> <p>5 Counsel. Your co-counsel has had them all along.</p> <p>6 MR. BERNICK: No, no, no. This looks</p> <p>7 nothing like that at all.</p> <p>8 MR. LEWIS: I don't know that that's</p> <p>9 the one we're talking about though. That's not the</p> <p>10 one with the measurements on it.</p> <p>11 MR. LONGOSZ: That's what he gave us at</p> <p>12 the start of the dep.</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: That's not the one with the</p> <p>14 measurements on it.</p> <p>15 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So we're clear,</p> <p>16 Dr. Whitehouse, this exhibit which is -- I don't know</p> <p>17 what it was marked as, but it was Final Key Libby</p> <p>18 Patients, the document that was given to us at the</p> <p>19 outset of the deposition has a list of people. There</p> <p>20 are a total of over 900 people. It does not contain</p> <p>21 the information that you and I were just talking</p> <p>22 about, fair?</p> <p>23 A No, it does not, no.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So this yellow spreadsheet --</p> <p>25 MR. BERNICK: Nate, have you ever heard</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 Q Is this --</p> <p>2 A -- longitudinal form.</p> <p>3 Q Well, just so we're clear, is Exhibit-15 the</p> <p>4 yellow spreadsheet that would reflect the data that</p> <p>5 you have referred to just now in your testimony?</p> <p>6 A Yeah, all the ones that I've seen were</p> <p>7 yellow. This, obviously, is not, but this is the</p> <p>8 spreadsheet.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So why don't you just tell me the</p> <p>10 people on the spreadsheet who you say have thinner</p> <p>11 pleura but still severe diffuse pleural thickening?</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: Excuse me, Counsel. May I</p> <p>13 have a copy, please?</p> <p>14 MR. BERNICK: Yeah, sure. (Document</p> <p>15 passed.)</p> <p>16 MR. LEWIS: Thank you kindly.</p> <p>17 MR. BERNICK: Sure.</p> <p>18 (Ms. Rickards returns from</p> <p>19 recess.)</p> <p>20 A Can I take this apart with a staple</p> <p>21 remover --</p> <p>22 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Sure.</p> <p>23 A -- so I can just match it up? I have to</p> <p>24 match the names here. Okay. The first one is the</p> <p>25 initials which is --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 of the yellow spreadsheet?</p> <p>2 MR. FINCH: I don't know about the</p> <p>3 yellow spreadsheet. Dr. Whitehouse has produced a</p> <p>4 lot of stuff. Whether it was in that, God only</p> <p>5 knows.</p> <p>6 MS. BLOOM: Does it have yellow</p> <p>7 markings on it?</p> <p>8 MR. FINCH: Yellow markings on it?</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Ah-ha, there it is.</p> <p>10 MR. LEWIS: Come on.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: It may not be yellow,</p> <p>12 but --</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Let's --</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Excuse me. I'm sorry.</p> <p>15 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay. This has been marked</p> <p>16 before. This is the 76 mortality CH -- I'll mark</p> <p>17 this.</p> <p>18 (Exhibit-15 marked for</p> <p>19 identification.)</p> <p>20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Does Exhibit-15 contain the</p> <p>21 data that you're talking about?</p> <p>22 A Well, it's going to -- yes, it does.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. So I --</p> <p>24 A It's got -- it's got the measurements of the</p> <p>25 pleura on it, but they're not in a --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1 Q Just mark it off. Just mark it off with a</p> <p>2 one. One indicating all -- one will indicate the</p> <p>3 people who you say show --</p> <p>4 MR. LEWIS: Well, they're numbered.</p> <p>5 Can he just go through and just give the numbers?</p> <p>6 MR. BERNICK: No, he -- if -- if --</p> <p>7 yeah, he can go --</p> <p>8 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Or you can go through and</p> <p>9 give me a list of numbers. Whatever is easier for</p> <p>10 you.</p> <p>11 A The best thing to do is to circle the ones.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Circle it, but I want -- then we're</p> <p>13 going to use a star on the next difference and -- I'm</p> <p>14 serious. I really want --</p> <p>15 MR. FINCH: And then a smiley face on</p> <p>16 the next difference.</p> <p>17 MR. BERNICK: Yeah, that's right.</p> <p>18 A Well, they're different columns, so it's --</p> <p>19 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I understand.</p> <p>20 A There shouldn't be an overlap.</p> <p>21 Q First question are those people you say have</p> <p>22 a different presentation of diffuse pleural</p> <p>23 thickening in Libby versus outside of Libby by reason</p> <p>24 of thickness.</p> <p>25 A So I'm just going to circle the ones -- out</p>

58 (Pages 226 to 229)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 230</p> <p>1 here in the side or do you want me to circle the 2 names? 3 Q You can circle the numbers is fine. 4 A All right. 5 Q As long as the name is right. 6 A May I ask a question? 7 Q Sure. 8 A Since the criteria is three millimeters, 9 shall I circle everything that's under three? 10 Q No, no, no, no, no. We're not -- I'm glad 11 you put that -- the question is very simple. You say 12 that the people in Libby present differently with 13 severe diffuse pleural thickening because the pleura 14 are not as thick as what would be observed outside. 15 Whoever it is that's picked up in that 16 difference in your mind is the basis for your 17 opinion, you circle, and then we'll get into further 18 questioning. 19 A All right. I'm only going to mark these 20 names. I'm not quite sure how to do this exactly 21 because I'm only going to mark the names if they have 22 minimal or no interstitial disease. Fair enough? 23 Q If that's what you -- 24 MR. LEWIS: Just -- just -- Doctor, you 25 need to just answer the question that the attorney</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 232</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: All right. 2 MR. BERNICK: When he says there's a 3 different presentation because of thickness, who is 4 he referring to? 5 MR. LEWIS: Right. 6 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Got it? 7 A Well, the only problem is as I mentioned to 8 you before -- yeah, I do have that. The only problem 9 is that I don't know whether there's any crossover in 10 people that actually presented -- just by looking at 11 that, presented with interstitial disease or may have 12 it now and that's why I'm wondering whether I should 13 eliminate some of these. That's what I was trying to 14 tell you a minute ago. 15 Q Why don't you put down a key in your own 16 words at the top right-hand portion of the first page 17 of Exhibit-15 and say -- just say circle equals. 18 A Okay. 19 Q Say circle equals -- 20 A I'll just say thin pleural thickening. It 21 doesn't say anything about interstitial disease. 22 Okay? 23 Q So the circle -- so the record is clear, the 24 circled people that you've now put on -15 are those 25 people that you say present differently with severe</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 231</p> <p>1 has asked. 2 THE WITNESS: Well, he's -- 3 MR. LEWIS: He hasn't asked anything 4 about interstitial disease as far as I know. 5 THE WITNESS: No, but he's asking for 6 circling of ones that presented with just pleural -- 7 thin pleural thickening and I don't want to then mark 8 somebody that meets their criteria that has severe -- 9 might have interstitial disease. Is that right or 10 not? 11 MR. LEWIS: Well, that's not what he 12 asked as I understand, but do the best you can. 13 THE WITNESS: All right. 14 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I asked you for difference 15 of presentation, diffuse pleural thickness. That's 16 what I'm assuming you're marking. 17 A And that's why I said that I didn't want to 18 mark the ones that had -- 19 Q I understand. 20 A -- interstitial -- 21 MR. LEWIS: Well, I think he -- is the 22 question regardless of interstitial disease or -- I 23 think that's the confusion. 24 MR. BERNICK: The question is the same 25 question that I started out with.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 233</p> <p>1 diffuse pleural thickening because their pleura is 2 thinner than what is reported in the literature; is 3 that fair? 4 A That's fair except that the one problem with 5 this is if they do have significant interstitial 6 disease, they may have presented with that and that 7 may be a major factor in that the pleural thickening 8 is not necessarily the biggest factor. 9 Q So now put -- next to the people who you 10 think may be presenting with significant interstitial 11 disease as those circled people who may have 12 significant interstitial disease, just put a check 13 next to those boxes. 14 A All right. That's what I was getting at 15 before. 16 Q Okay. 17 A So I'm only going to check 1/1s or more or 18 what do you want? 2/1s? You want the criteria 19 for -- 20 Q Well, whatever you would think to be the 21 appropriate measure of there being some significant 22 interstitial disease. I think that -- whatever you 23 would use. 24 A All right. If I can just get these lines at 25 the bottom to match up. I'll make that clearer. Oh,</p>

59 (Pages 230 to 233)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 234</p> <p>1 wait a minute. That's the wrong one. Damn it.</p> <p>2 Q You can scratch it off.</p> <p>3 A It's hard to see across here even though</p> <p>4 there's a crosshatch area in here.</p> <p>5 Q I've noticed.</p> <p>6 A That's this one here. Here we go. Oh, I</p> <p>7 guess that's the best I can tell.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. So --</p> <p>9 A That check is equal to IF -- equal to 1/2 or</p> <p>10 greater. I think that's what I've got.</p> <p>11 Q 1 what?</p> <p>12 A 1/2.</p> <p>13 Q 1/2?</p> <p>14 A Well, 1/2, ILO 1/2. We've got 1/1s.</p> <p>15 Q I know, but --</p> <p>16 A How significant do you want it? I guess</p> <p>17 that's the --</p> <p>18 Q Well, I don't know. I mean the question --</p> <p>19 it's really up to you. This is --</p> <p>20 A Are we --</p> <p>21 Q This is all by way of comparison,</p> <p>22 Dr. Whitehouse. We want to know people who present</p> <p>23 at Libby differently from people who present outside</p> <p>24 of Libby.</p> <p>25 A All right.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 236</p> <p>1 Q If you notice on the TDP, significant</p> <p>2 interstitial disease all requires -- all it requires</p> <p>3 is 1/0.</p> <p>4 A Well, then, if you want me to use -- is that</p> <p>5 all or is there 1/1?</p> <p>6 Q No, no, for the TDP that qualifies having</p> <p>7 interstitial disease, it's 1/0.</p> <p>8 A All right. I'll do 1/0s then.</p> <p>9 MR. BERNICK: Is that right?</p> <p>10 MR. FINCH: It's for everything but the</p> <p>11 most severe category, yeah.</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: The severe category is 2/1,</p> <p>13 right?</p> <p>14 MR. BERNICK: That's the most severe.</p> <p>15 MR. FINCH: That's the most severe.</p> <p>16 MR. BERNICK: Four is 1/0.</p> <p>17 MR. FINCH: Category three is 1/0.</p> <p>18 MR. BERNICK: Three is 1/0.</p> <p>19 A God, whether this is right or not, who knows.</p> <p>20 I'm sure you'll sort it out. Well, let you figure</p> <p>21 that one out.</p> <p>22 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I'm not sure -- you make</p> <p>23 sure your key is -- go back one --</p> <p>24 A I left the key as 1/0.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So now you tell us on the record on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 235</p> <p>1 Q Because you're saying that they present</p> <p>2 differently at Libby because they have thinner pleura</p> <p>3 and they're still impaired, and what you said is that</p> <p>4 there's a complication in those cases where people</p> <p>5 have interstitial disease as well, correct?</p> <p>6 A Yeah, and I'm going to check the -- I'm going</p> <p>7 to check the ones that I consider to be significant</p> <p>8 disease, but most of these are 1/0s or 0/1s.</p> <p>9 Q Right. So --</p> <p>10 A And I hope I don't miss any because it's</p> <p>11 conceivable I might miss one.</p> <p>12 Q So what are -- you've got circled the ones</p> <p>13 that have the thin membranes --</p> <p>14 A Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q -- thin pleura, and you're now putting a</p> <p>16 check mark next to those of them that also have</p> <p>17 interstitial disease?</p> <p>18 A Right.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. And what's your criteria for</p> <p>20 interstitial --</p> <p>21 A Well, I'm just using 1/2, but I would use 1/1</p> <p>22 if that's what you prefer.</p> <p>23 Q Well, whatever it is that you think is the</p> <p>24 marker of significant interstitial disease.</p> <p>25 A Well, I think the marker --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 237</p> <p>1 Exhibit-15 -- I haven't even looked at what you've</p> <p>2 marked off. You tell us what you have done with</p> <p>3 Exhibit-15 in order to elucidate the different</p> <p>4 presentation of diffuse pleural thickening, severe</p> <p>5 diffuse pleural thickening at Libby versus outside of</p> <p>6 Libby.</p> <p>7 A Well, I've got seven or eight. Is that an</p> <p>8 eighth one? Yes, I have eight people here.</p> <p>9 Q And those eight people are noted or marked --</p> <p>10 A Out of the mortality study that have thin</p> <p>11 pleural thickening and ILOs 1/0 or less.</p> <p>12 Q 1/0 or less?</p> <p>13 A Yeah.</p> <p>14 Q So you would say that anybody --</p> <p>15 A Wait a minute. 1/0 or greater I checked and</p> <p>16 then the ones that are less than that are 0/1 or less</p> <p>17 are the ones that are -- they're not checked and</p> <p>18 there's -- let's see. One, two, three, four, five,</p> <p>19 six, seven -- eight of them.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. So there are eight people that you've</p> <p>21 marked with plan circles on Exhibit-15?</p> <p>22 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>23 Q And they represent people who illustrate or</p> <p>24 the basis for your saying that diffuse -- severe</p> <p>25 diffuse pleural thickening at Libby presents</p>

60 (Pages 234 to 237)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 238</p> <p>1 differently from outside of Libby in that the</p> <p>2 membranes or the pleura are thinner, fair?</p> <p>3 A That's -- that's part of it, but, yes.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. Now, the other difference that you've</p> <p>5 pointed to in presentation is that people at Libby</p> <p>6 with severe diffuse pleural thickening with less</p> <p>7 exposure history?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Could you please mark -- is the basis for</p> <p>10 that difference, again, your observations with</p> <p>11 respect to the 79 people in the CARD mortality study?</p> <p>12 A Well, you know, community members would be</p> <p>13 the most likely situation, but that's a little hard</p> <p>14 to do without actually having the chart.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Well, I'm just asking you the</p> <p>16 second -- the second difference that you pointed out</p> <p>17 which has to do with exposure, is the source of that</p> <p>18 difference, the opinion about that difference your 79</p> <p>19 people in the CARD study?</p> <p>20 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>21 Q You have to respond orally.</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And can you identify those people using</p> <p>24 Exhibit-15 or not?</p> <p>25 A Well, I can -- I can demonstrate all the ones</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 240</p> <p>1 and then I'll put a star next to those or an X next</p> <p>2 to them if they have severe disease. Is that what</p> <p>3 you want me to do?</p> <p>4 Q Yeah, I want only the ones that you say have</p> <p>5 diffuse -- severe diffuse -- severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>6 thickening with low exposure. Are you with me?</p> <p>7 A I'm with you.</p> <p>8 Q Okay.</p> <p>9 A Where shall I put the X here? That will</p> <p>10 work, right there. Okay? It looks like we've got</p> <p>11 about another -- it looks like there's no crossover</p> <p>12 here. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven,</p> <p>13 eight, nine, ten -- eleven of them that are community</p> <p>14 exposure.</p> <p>15 Q So wait. So what you've now done is defined</p> <p>16 the people with community exposures, right?</p> <p>17 A Mm-hm, mm-hm.</p> <p>18 Q But are these people now with community</p> <p>19 exposure and severe diffuse pleural thickening?</p> <p>20 A As best I can tell, yeah, from the numbers</p> <p>21 that I have here.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And do they also have -- do they</p> <p>23 have -- do they not have interstitial disease?</p> <p>24 A Well, I'd have to go back and look at it</p> <p>25 again then because I don't know which ones do have</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 239</p> <p>1 that had only community exposure. Okay? Which is</p> <p>2 going to be the ones with low exposure.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Well, then put an E next to those.</p> <p>4 A Why don't I just circle the C?</p> <p>5 Q I'm sorry?</p> <p>6 A Want me to circle the Cs?</p> <p>7 Q Circle the Cs?</p> <p>8 A Where it says exposure.</p> <p>9 Q Where it says exposure? Oh, I see, yeah.</p> <p>10 A I just circled where it had C on them --</p> <p>11 Q Well, whatever --</p> <p>12 A -- but not the family member ones because</p> <p>13 there are some that are a question of whether it's a</p> <p>14 family member or not.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. So before you do that, let's just</p> <p>16 think this thing through so we've got a question and</p> <p>17 answer and we don't do it more than once,</p> <p>18 Dr. Whitehouse.</p> <p>19 I want people who are presenting with severe</p> <p>20 diffuse pleural thickening, severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>21 thickening --</p> <p>22 A Okay.</p> <p>23 Q -- with what you say is a lower exposure than</p> <p>24 what has been reported in the literature.</p> <p>25 A Okay. So I'll circle the ones that are Cs</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 241</p> <p>1 the interstitial disease.</p> <p>2 Q Well, then check that out because I want</p> <p>3 people, again, who have diffuse -- severe diffuse</p> <p>4 pleural thickening with the impairment and the</p> <p>5 differences that they have low exposure because</p> <p>6 that's what you said your second difference was.</p> <p>7 A Where is the interstitial disease?</p> <p>8 MR. FINCH: On the third page.</p> <p>9 A Oh, here it is. Well, I don't know what</p> <p>10 kind of -- we'll use a star.</p> <p>11 Q (By Mr. Bernick) A star is going to</p> <p>12 represent what?</p> <p>13 A Interstitial disease.</p> <p>14 Q Okay.</p> <p>15 A Okay. I think that's it.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. So what have you now marked off?</p> <p>17 A Eight of those. How many do we have all</p> <p>18 altogether did I say? Doesn't seem to be much</p> <p>19 crossover between the extensive pleural thickening</p> <p>20 and any interstitial fibrosis, a couple down here,</p> <p>21 and then all the rest of them had extensive disease,</p> <p>22 but did not have interstitial disease.</p> <p>23 Q Let me see -15 now, sir.</p> <p>24 A (Document passed.)</p> <p>25 Q If I can make --</p>

61 (Pages 238 to 241)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 242</p> <p>1 A There's the rest of the sheets, if you want 2 to have it.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. So you've marked off with a circle on 4 Exhibit-15 those who have thin pleural thickening, 5 and by that, you mean those who you believe have 6 severe diffuse pleural thickening, but with a thinner 7 pleura than what's reported in the literature?</p> <p>8 A Yeah, well, they died. Those are ones that 9 died of their disease so we can assume that it was 10 severe from that sheet there.</p> <p>11 Q Oh.</p> <p>12 A Because I don't have all the rest of the 13 other data here, you know, at this point, but if they 14 died and are on that sheet, they died essentially of 15 asbestos disease, and so if the only thing that's 16 marked is thin pleural thickening on there, that was 17 it.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So what if their lung function was 19 not -- was not below normal?</p> <p>20 A That's very possible. It probably was not. 21 It was -- probably was below normal for most of 22 those, I would think, or it was people that had lost 23 a tremendous amount of lung function.</p> <p>24 Q Well, but this affects things. 25 Is there anybody that you've identified --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 244</p> <p>1 is, you've circled them because they died, but which 2 ones of them actually had, before they died, a loss 3 of lung function?</p> <p>4 A Let me -- let me -- it's on here.</p> <p>5 Q I know.</p> <p>6 A But it's a wrong -- it's very hard to read. 7 Let me have these sheets. I thought you had the ones 8 that were all taped together. It had colors on it so 9 that they could be easier to --</p> <p>10 Q Okay. So what I want -- here, I'll make it 11 even --</p> <p>12 A Well, there's a problem. There is a problem 13 here, a little bit.</p> <p>14 Q Yeah.</p> <p>15 MR. FINCH: David?</p> <p>16 MR. BERNICK: What?</p> <p>17 A No, wait a minute. I guess I've got the data 18 and I thought --</p> <p>19 MR. LEWIS: No, I think you got it.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I got it.</p> <p>21 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So I want: Of those people 22 with those thin membranes and without the diffuse -- 23 without the fibrosis, pure -- just the -- not pure. 24 Those people who had severe diffuse pleural 25 thickening, I want to know and I want you to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 243</p> <p>1 anybody that you've identified that's -- now, taking 2 a look at Exhibit-15, try to round out these 3 differences because I now understand more of where 4 you're coming from, but you've identified a 5 difference in the presentation at Libby that people 6 with severe diffuse pleural thickening present 7 differently from those in the literature because 8 their pleura are thinner, right?</p> <p>9 A Mm-hm, at the time of death.</p> <p>10 Q All right. And you've -- you've indicated 11 who they are on Exhibit-15 by putting in a zero. 12 You've also though put a check mark next to those of 13 that group who had interstitial involvement, right?</p> <p>14 A Yeah.</p> <p>15 Q So if we wanted to focus purely on those who 16 had diffuse pleural thickening and not on those who 17 also had interstitial fibrosis, we would take a look 18 at the zeros that did not have a check mark, correct?</p> <p>19 A Correct, mm-hm.</p> <p>20 Q And as I look at it, that would be number 2, 21 number 6, number 14, 15, number 38, number 51 and 52, 22 and number 69, right?</p> <p>23 A Correct.</p> <p>24 Q Now, of those people, which ones of them 25 actually had a recorded loss of lung function, that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 245</p> <p>1 yellow-highlight the number of those who had a below 2 normal lung function at the time of death.</p> <p>3 A Okay. I don't know if I can see that. I'm 4 color blind, by the way. This is enough to challenge 5 your vision.</p> <p>6 Q Which ones have you highlighted?</p> <p>7 A Every one of them.</p> <p>8 Q That has below normal lung function at the 9 time of death?</p> <p>10 A Every one so far. I think they're all going 11 to be, I suspect, but we'll see in a minute, won't 12 we? Now, wait a minute. Every one.</p> <p>13 Q Every one of the ones that you marked as 14 having thin membranes, thin pleura had below normal 15 lung function at the time of death?</p> <p>16 A Yeah, every one of them.</p> <p>17 Q And as a measure, what did you use as the 18 measure of below normal lung function?</p> <p>19 A Well, basically, I was using 80 percent, but 20 actually, I could just as soon use --</p> <p>21 Q 80 percent of what?</p> <p>22 A 80 percent of predicted, but I could just use 23 lower than that because I don't think there was 24 anything --</p> <p>25 Q 80 percent of predicted for what number?</p>

62 (Pages 242 to 245)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 246</p> <p>1 A I was using, basically, FVCs or DLCOs.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Now, FVC or DLCO less than 80?</p> <p>3 A Yeah. We have a lot of DLCOs in here in the</p> <p>4 40 range, 30 and 40 range.</p> <p>5 Q Now, with respect to all those people that</p> <p>6 you have yellow-highlighted, which ones of them were</p> <p>7 smokers?</p> <p>8 A I don't -- I don't know if I have that on</p> <p>9 here. Do I? I don't think so.</p> <p>10 Q Well, wouldn't you want to know that?</p> <p>11 A Oh, here we are. Yeah, I guess we do have</p> <p>12 that on this one. We did put that on this one.</p> <p>13 Well, let's see. Why don't you score this yourself?</p> <p>14 Active smokers, now there's one, two... (Pause.)</p> <p>15 Q I want active or former smokers.</p> <p>16 A Well, there's a bunch of them that quit a</p> <p>17 long time -- actually, a long time ago.</p> <p>18 Q You don't necessarily know when they quit</p> <p>19 from this, do you?</p> <p>20 A Oh, I know their pack years and their age, so</p> <p>21 it probably was a long time ago.</p> <p>22 Q But you don't really know that either?</p> <p>23 A No, I don't.</p> <p>24 Q Let me just ask you: Are there any people</p> <p>25 that you've highlighted in yellow, that is, having</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 248</p> <p>1 Q And have you also done that on Exhibit-15?</p> <p>2 Just hand that over here.</p> <p>3 A Oh, okay. Yeah, the key is down here on the</p> <p>4 bottom.</p> <p>5 Q So in order to indicate those people who are</p> <p>6 different because they had community exposures and</p> <p>7 still had severe diffuse pleural thickening, you've</p> <p>8 indicated those with the exposures -- low exposures</p> <p>9 with a C. With an X, those who had extensive --</p> <p>10 A Pleural thickening.</p> <p>11 Q -- pleural thickening and then a star if they</p> <p>12 had interstitial involvement. So to figure out which</p> <p>13 ones of them are the evidence of your second</p> <p>14 difference, which is low exposure, you'd look for</p> <p>15 people who have a C and X and no star, correct?</p> <p>16 A Yeah.</p> <p>17 Q And of those C, X, no star, we have seven --</p> <p>18 Baker is 7. We have Cole, 15, and Cole, 16. We have</p> <p>19 Fehrs, 30. Yeah, C, X -- C, X -- I'm sorry. That's</p> <p>20 not Fehrs. That's Erickson, 29. We have Hammer, 37.</p> <p>21 We have Kujawa, 47. And we have Lundstrom, 49.</p> <p>22 Shockley, 65. And Thompson, 70. Right?</p> <p>23 A Yeah, I wasn't looking at the names.</p> <p>24 Q Now, of those people, which ones of them</p> <p>25 actually had below normal lung function before death?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 247</p> <p>1 thin pleural tissue and severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>2 thickening who had no smoking history?</p> <p>3 A I've got one here. I think one and then I've</p> <p>4 got one with a pipe. I don't know if that's going to</p> <p>5 count or not. I think that's all I've got. Most of</p> <p>6 them quit. They have a Q by them.</p> <p>7 Q Just so we're clear, all the people that</p> <p>8 you've pointed to as evidence that in Libby there's a</p> <p>9 different presentation of diffuse -- severe diffuse</p> <p>10 pleural thickening because of the thinness of the</p> <p>11 pleura, you've marked off those people. You've also</p> <p>12 indicated which ones of them do not have -- or do not</p> <p>13 have interstitial involvement.</p> <p>14 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>15 Q And of all those people who had those thin</p> <p>16 pleura, only one of them was a never smoker, correct?</p> <p>17 A Correct.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. If we now go to the community</p> <p>19 exposures --</p> <p>20 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>21 Q -- that's people that you say presented with</p> <p>22 severe diffuse pleural thickening with lower than</p> <p>23 expected exposures. Have you also then indicated</p> <p>24 which ones of them did not have interstitial disease?</p> <p>25 A Yeah, I have.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 249</p> <p>1 A Well, then you have to give that back to me</p> <p>2 again and I could tell you, probably.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And mark those up with yellow.</p> <p>4 A I'm mark it through their C here.</p> <p>5 Q These are C, X, no stars, right?</p> <p>6 A Yeah.</p> <p>7 Q C, X, no stars with below normal lung</p> <p>8 function at the time of death.</p> <p>9 A No X, so we won't do that one.</p> <p>10 Q C, X, no star, plus below normal lung</p> <p>11 function.</p> <p>12 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) Oh, it</p> <p>13 looks like they're all going to be in yellow. I hope</p> <p>14 you can see the yellow because I can't. All of these</p> <p>15 are low -- you can sort out which ones have excess.</p> <p>16 Q And of this group, how many of them were</p> <p>17 never smokers?</p> <p>18 A Were never smokers?</p> <p>19 Q Yeah.</p> <p>20 A I'll look it up. There's one, two, three --</p> <p>21 three, four, five -- five.</p> <p>22 Q Five.</p> <p>23 So if we take these first two differences</p> <p>24 that you've identified in presentation, that is,</p> <p>25 thinness of plural tissue and low exposure and you</p>

63 (Pages 246 to 249)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 250</p> <p>1 indicate -- you separate out those that had 2 interstitial involvement and you looked to people who 3 had below normal lung function at the time of death, 4 there are a total of five people who were never 5 smokers? 6 A Probably. That may be. 7 Q Well, that's what you've indicated, right? 8 A Yeah, whatever I told you. 9 Q Now, if they're people who have smoking 10 history, they're going to have -- smoking causes both 11 restrictive impairment and obstructive impairment of 12 lung function, correct? 13 A No, they cause diseases that may give you 14 obstructive disease, but in their own right, they do 15 not. Only about eight to ten percent of people that 16 are smokers get significant lung disease from their 17 smoking, so -- 18 Q I'm sorry. Who -- 19 A -- no, I would not agree with you at all 20 about -- 21 Q Well, people who -- I'm sorry. People who 22 are current or former smokers, those who do suffer 23 affects from the smoking with loss of lung function, 24 that is, principally obstructive lung function, 25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 252</p> <p>1 A I believe you do. 2 Q -- in their entirety for all the 79? 3 A I believe you do, as far as I know. I mean, 4 I wasn't in charge of getting them to you, but I 5 think you have them all. 6 Q No, because the 79 includes people who are 7 not your patients, right? 8 A Oh, you should have a redacted file for that. 9 Q No, we don't. No, we don't. 10 MR. LEWIS: Yes, you do. 11 Q (By Mr. Bernick) We have x-rays. We do not 12 have redacted files. The redaction wasn't done. 13 Redaction -- there's an objection that it'll be 14 costly to do the redaction, but we don't have the 15 redacted files. 16 MR. LEWIS: I think you do have the 17 redacted ones for the study. That's what I -- I 18 honestly believe that. I could check on that. 19 MR. BERNICK: I don't believe so. 20 MR. LEWIS: I think you do. 21 Q (By Mr. Bernick) In any event, if we wanted 22 to see what the impact of smoking was within the 79, 23 it would be best to have the medical files, correct? 24 A Yeah, it would be, but you'd also need to 25 make sure that when you're dealing -- and if you see</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 251</p> <p>1 A Yes, if they -- if they develop emphysema, 2 yes, that's the case. 3 Q Okay. Now, how many of the people that 4 you've identified in your first category, which is 5 the thinner pleura, had obstructive lung function 6 from smoking? Can we figure that out? 7 A That is going to be very difficult to figure 8 out off of this. 9 Q What would we need in order to figure that 10 out? 11 A Tables and continuity, actually, so that you 12 could actually look at them. This is pretty hard to 13 see anything on this thing. 14 Q Well, would it be best to actually figure 15 out -- if we wanted to know these two differences and 16 what effect, if any, smoking had on the people with 17 these two presentational differences, thin pleura and 18 shorter exposure history, if we really wanted to know 19 what the impact of smoking was, wouldn't we need 20 their medical files? 21 A Probably would, yeah. 22 Q And do we have the medical files for all the 23 79? 24 A Yes, you do. 25 Q We have all the medical files --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 253</p> <p>1 an obstructive defect, whether it's an obstructive 2 defect due to asbestos disease or whether it's 3 related to smoking -- 4 Q Okay. 5 A -- and emphysema. 6 (Exhibit-16 marked for 7 identification.) 8 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Now, I want to move quickly 9 through the rest of the questions that I have. This 10 is very helpful and I appreciate your taking the time 11 to do it. 12 I'm going to give you Exhibit-16. Exhibit-16 13 is the same thing. I now want to talk about the two 14 other points of distinction that you identified for 15 people at Libby. 16 One point -- further point of distinction 17 was, you said, the rapidity of progression? 18 A Yes. 19 Q The second was progression to death, correct? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And I take it that with respect to 22 non-malignant disease, your evidence to support both 23 of those points comes again from the CARD mortality 24 data, correct? 25 A Well, the progression comes from other</p>

64 (Pages 250 to 253)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 254</p> <p>1 places, if that's what you're talking about, you 2 know, the rapid progression of it. 3 Q Okay. Let's talk about rapid progression 4 first. 5 A Okay. 6 Q Your evidence of rapid progression at Libby 7 that's different from elsewhere, the source of that 8 data -- that data source is what? 9 A You have it. You have a list of names of 10 people and you have the x-rays for them of people 11 that have had rapid progression of their disease over 12 a short period of time. It's something that's been 13 working and I've worked on to prepare for a paper, 14 but it isn't -- it isn't ready to be published yet, 15 but you have the pulmonary function numbers on those 16 people and you have the x-rays and you have the names 17 and only two of them are not clients and they're in 18 the -- they're initialed in that list. 19 Now, I don't know where it is, but I know you 20 do have that. 21 Q Just -- you're ahead of me. 22 A Yeah. 23 Q For your opinion that says that there's more 24 rapid progression at Libby -- 25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 256</p> <p>1 Q Is the answer to that yes? 2 A Yes. 3 Q And how many of the people in the CARD 4 mortality data set are people who progressed to death 5 from severe diffuse pleural thickening? How many? 6 A From severe diffuse pleural thickening? 7 Q Yes, all I'm focused on is severe diffuse 8 pleural thickening. 9 A Well, we had the low exposure ones that you 10 already know about when the death was -- 11 Q This is why, Dr. Whitehouse, it's so critical 12 that we peel off these questions one at a time. 13 We've been through people with the different 14 presentations, that is, thinner pleura and low 15 exposure. I now want to know the people whose cases 16 you relied upon for your opinions about rapidity of 17 progression. 18 A Okay. You have that. It was in -- it was in 19 my expert report and you have a copy of that in your 20 expert report that has the pulmonary functions on 21 eighteen people and you have a CD somewhere that has 22 all the x-rays of those people, the serial x-rays. 23 There it is, right there. He's got it. And there's 24 another page that shows the pulmonary function. 25 Q Okay. Now, this is -- I'm working with</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 255</p> <p>1 Q -- the source of that opinion is data with 2 respect to which people? Which people? 3 A Those are the ones I was just telling you 4 about, the eighteen. That's part of it. That's the 5 eighteen that are a study population of people that 6 have rapidly progressed that we have documentation of 7 it, both radiographically and with pulmonary 8 functions. 9 We actually have some more of them that -- a 10 number of other ones that I decided I wasn't going to 11 use for the study because I didn't like the quality 12 of the x-rays or something else. I had to have 13 something that I could document easily. 14 Q Again, we're not communicating. Let me take 15 this a step back. 16 I know about the paper that was published in 17 2004. 18 A This is not published. 19 Q Okay. So let's begin and talk about data 20 that you have on progression. There's the paper in 21 2004, right? 22 A Yes. 23 Q You then have people who are in the CARD 24 mortality data set? 25 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 257</p> <p>1 Exhibit-6 -- Exhibit-6 to Dr. Whitehouse's May 2009 2 report; is that right, Dr. Whitehouse? 3 MR. LEWIS: Which is exhibit -- is it 4 Exhibit-1 to this deposition? 5 MR. BERNICK: Yes. 6 MR. FINCH: Yes. 7 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay. So if we go to that, 8 these are Exhibit-6 to your May report, '09 report, 9 are the people who you believe have got rapid 10 progression that's distinctive to Libby from 11 diffuse -- severe diffuse plural thickening; is that 12 correct? 13 A And I've actually been told that this is 14 really unusual by the people at Mount Sinai -- 15 Q I didn't ask you that. 16 A -- to do that. 17 Q I didn't ask you that. 18 I just want to know what your data was. Is 19 that accurate, this is the basis for your opinion -- 20 A Yes. 21 Q -- on rapidity of progression; is that right? 22 A That's part of it, yes. 23 Q Okay. This data set, who are these people? 24 How do we get from case number here -- 25 A Let me show you.</p>

65 (Pages 254 to 257)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 258</p> <p>1 Q -- to your spreadsheet? Are they all --</p> <p>2 A This one -- they're not on this spreadsheet.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. So --</p> <p>4 A These people are alive.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. So Exhibit-6 to your May report are</p> <p>6 people who are all alive?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And they show rapidity of progression?</p> <p>9 A Yeah, and now if you turn the page over,</p> <p>10 you'll see the names of them.</p> <p>11 Q You'll see the names are on the back of the</p> <p>12 paper?</p> <p>13 A And the initials.</p> <p>14 Q And the --</p> <p>15 A No, the next page down there.</p> <p>16 Q Oh, it's the next page. It's the names and</p> <p>17 initials?</p> <p>18 A Yeah.</p> <p>19 Q Fair enough.</p> <p>20 And these are different from the people who</p> <p>21 are on -- who were part of the mortality study?</p> <p>22 A That's right.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Is there any other data set that you</p> <p>24 rely upon for your opinions regarding rapidity of</p> <p>25 progression?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 260</p> <p>1 Q (By Mr. Bernick) But the question is -- but</p> <p>2 the question is -- I know that these are people that</p> <p>3 you saw, but why is it you say that these particular</p> <p>4 people who are listed in Exhibit-6 to your May report</p> <p>5 show rapidity of progression from diffuse pleural</p> <p>6 thickening?</p> <p>7 A Let me have the sheet here for a second.</p> <p>8 Q I don't want interstitial stuff. I want --</p> <p>9 A No.</p> <p>10 Q -- just your diffuse pleural thickening.</p> <p>11 A Oh, I think there's one interstitial in here</p> <p>12 probably, but most of it's -- maybe two. Oh, they</p> <p>13 did it on this -- it makes it a little harder to</p> <p>14 read. They put the before, see, on one page, and the</p> <p>15 after on the next page.</p> <p>16 MR. FINCH: Which one?</p> <p>17 MR. BERNICK: It's his report. Has his</p> <p>18 report been marked as an --</p> <p>19 MR. FINCH: Yeah, it's Exhibit-1.</p> <p>20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) It's Exhibit-1.</p> <p>21 A Yeah.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. So can we just get that? That will</p> <p>23 save us a lot of time. In your stack of exhibits,</p> <p>24 see if you have Exhibit-1.</p> <p>25 MR. LEWIS: I'll help you.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 259</p> <p>1 A No, only my personal experience.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Now, the rapidity of progression that</p> <p>3 we see here on Exhibit-6 to your May report, what was</p> <p>4 the criteria for inclusion of these people, that is,</p> <p>5 how did you pick these people out?</p> <p>6 A I haven't worked on this for a while, so I'm</p> <p>7 trying to remember exactly what -- what I decided.</p> <p>8 It was something like about a twenty percent drop in</p> <p>9 lung function over a period of less than two years, I</p> <p>10 think, as I recall, two years. Maybe four years. I</p> <p>11 think maybe it is four years.</p> <p>12 Q Are there documents that would enable you</p> <p>13 to -- enable us to see what the basis was for your</p> <p>14 saying that there was rapid progression in these</p> <p>15 people?</p> <p>16 A Turn the page over and look at the pulmonary</p> <p>17 functions and you can see what happened to the</p> <p>18 pulmonary functions and the dates are on there and</p> <p>19 all.</p> <p>20 Q But what I want to know is -- what I want to</p> <p>21 know is why you picked these people.</p> <p>22 A Oh, those are people that I saw in the clinic</p> <p>23 and that Dr. Black saw and made me aware of and so</p> <p>24 that's how they wound up in that.</p> <p>25 MR. FINCH: Use this copy.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 261</p> <p>1 MR. BERNICK: Thank you very much. I</p> <p>2 appreciate that.</p> <p>3 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So we'll go to Exhibit-1</p> <p>4 and we'll go to tab six, and I want you to identify,</p> <p>5 if you can, the people in this collection who do not</p> <p>6 have interstitial involvement, that is, who were just</p> <p>7 severe diffuse pleural thickening.</p> <p>8 A Well, they'll tell you. It's number three</p> <p>9 and it's number thirteen.</p> <p>10 Q Number three and number thirteen?</p> <p>11 A And number five. And number five has some</p> <p>12 interstitial disease too.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. So in the list on Exhibit-6, the ones</p> <p>14 with -- that are -- that have severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>15 thickening without --</p> <p>16 A I didn't say these had diffuse severe pleural</p> <p>17 thickening.</p> <p>18 Q That's all I want. I just want to know only</p> <p>19 about severe diffuse pleural thickening because</p> <p>20 that's the category I'm focused on in the TDP. I</p> <p>21 want to know those people in your list you had that</p> <p>22 you think is unusually rapid progression from severe</p> <p>23 diffuse pleural thickening.</p> <p>24 MR. LEWIS: I think -- I think --</p> <p>25 forgive me, Counsel, but I think that's not the</p>

66 (Pages 258 to 261)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 262</p> <p>1 purpose of this chart. I think we're just talking 2 about progression here as -- and not defining in 3 terms of severity. 4 MR. BERNICK: I understand that. 5 That's why I want to know because the criticism is 6 lodged with respect to that TDP category. I'm 7 focused -- all my stuff is focused on that category. 8 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So I need to know -- when 9 you say that there's been more rapid progression from 10 severe diffuse pleural thickening, I need to know 11 whose cases you're pointing to. 12 A I can't identify them individually. There's 13 no way to do it from what I have here. There's no 14 way to identify them. 15 Q What do you -- 16 A I have a pretty good idea that they're all 17 severe and they were all severe at the end of 18 their -- I can tell you which ones I know for sure 19 are severe as far as their pleural disease because I 20 took -- as you mentioned, there's a couple of 21 interstitial ones in here and I won't discuss those. 22 Q Well, what I need -- I don't want to have to 23 just rely on your memory, Dr. Whitehouse, because I 24 know you wouldn't want to rely upon that either. 25 A Well --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 264</p> <p>1 interstitial disease except for three. Number three 2 I know doesn't have much pleural disease. 3 Q Okay. And then what would we look for in the 4 charts? What in the charts did you look to in order 5 to say that they had more rapid progression of 6 diffuse -- severe diffuse pleural thickening of 7 what's reported in the literature? 8 A Well, the first thing I looked at -- the 9 first thing I looked at was their pulmonary functions 10 which is -- tells you a world of information if you 11 look at those because most of them dropped by 50 12 percent over a period of a couple years, and then you 13 look at the x-rays and see what happened in their 14 x-rays. 15 Q But what was the criteria for your saying 16 that it was more rapid than what appeared in the 17 literature? 18 A I think I'd have to look at the draft of the 19 paper. I don't have it with me and I'm sure you 20 don't have it either and it is, indeed, a draft, but 21 I think it was -- and I haven't -- and the reason I 22 don't remember it is because I haven't really looked 23 at this for six months and I haven't had time to, but 24 I think it's -- I think it was either a 20 or 30 25 percent drop in the FVC or DLCO over a period of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 263</p> <p>1 Q But if we wanted to know those people who had 2 severe diffuse pleural thickening at Libby that you 3 say are distinctive because of rapidity of 4 progression, where would we go to find out who they 5 are and the basis for that? 6 A Who they are is here, and I guess you could 7 go to your other sheet, if they're on the mortality 8 study, but most of these are not. There's only one 9 that I know of, maybe two, on that mortality study. 10 You have to go to the charts. 11 Q Have to go to their charts? 12 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 13 Q But which charts do we have to go to? The 14 people that -- 15 A All of them -- all of them except the ones 16 that have interstitial disease, look at them. 17 Q As the charts -- so we would go to the charts 18 of people who are listed in Exhibit- -- tab six to 19 Exhibit-1 of this deposition, we would go there? 20 A Right. 21 Q And then we would look for the individual 22 charts of those people who are listed other than the 23 ones with interstitial disease, and what would we 24 look for? 25 A I think you should look at the ones with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 265</p> <p>1 about three to four years. 2 Q Three to four years? 3 A Yeah, that's considered rapid in asbestos. 4 Q And so I want to be able to -- again, I want 5 to be able to rely upon this so that if you say 6 something, we'll hold you to it when you testify in 7 September. 8 A Well -- 9 Q We'll hold you -- 10 A -- take a look at the numbers. 11 Q Well, I don't want to -- I don't want to take 12 a look at the numbers. I want to know your expert -- 13 what you did by way of an expert analysis. I want to 14 be able to say we talked to you back in June of this 15 year -- when you testify in September, I want to say 16 you told us back in June, Dr. Whitehouse, that 17 rapidity of progression that was different at Libby 18 was determined by X and we've now gone out and tested 19 it, so I need to have you to be able to tell us, if 20 you can, what the criteria was or what the fact was 21 that you observed in these people such that you said 22 there was more rapid progression from diffuse pleural 23 thickening than what's reported in the literature. 24 A I'll have -- you know, there's one that was 25 radiographic. The rest of them are both radiographic</p>

67 (Pages 262 to 265)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 266</p> <p>1 and pulmonary function and I'll have to look it up 2 and I'll get it to you. There's no way I can 3 remember it now and I'm not even going to try. 4 Q See, I can't deal with that. I'm taking your 5 deposition today. 6 A Well, I can't give it to you because I don't 7 remember. Okay? 8 Q Okay. 9 A And you'll have to live with that. 10 Q But how do you know -- well, actually, let me 11 just ask you: What do you think -- let's go back 12 over this for a second. We talked about the 13 difference in the thickness of the pleura, right? 14 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 15 Q And you said you think that the people at 16 Libby present differently with diffuse pleural 17 thickening because they have severe impairment 18 with -- even though their pleura tissue is thinner 19 than what's reported in the literature. 20 When you made that comparison, what did you 21 assume the thickness was that was reported in the 22 literature for people outside of Libby? 23 A No, I was -- I was using for comparison the 24 plan's three millimeter. 25 Q Oh, you mean the TDP?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 268</p> <p>1 the thickness of the tissue from how it is has been 2 reported, the thickness that's been reported outside 3 of Libby in the scientific literature? 4 A I haven't -- I doubt it's any significant 5 difference because it's -- I think it's more a matter 6 of degree or more the matter of frequency than it is 7 the amount of degree. I'm sure you can find the same 8 thing in -- outside of Libby in people if you look 9 for it. That's all. 10 Q Okay. Now, have you done the scientific 11 analysis to say, I've measured and determined that 12 the frequency of thinner pleura in Libby people is 13 greater than the frequency reported in the 14 literature? Have you done that? 15 A No. 16 Q What about when it comes to low exposure? 17 Low exposure has been reported. We know low exposure 18 has been reported as a source of diffuse pleural 19 thickening outside of Libby, correct? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Do you know that the -- have you actually 22 scientifically determined that the frequency of 23 reporting of severe diffuse pleural thickening at 24 Libby is actually higher than the frequency of 25 reporting of diffuse pleural thickening with low</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 267</p> <p>1 A Yeah, the TDP is three millimeters is what I 2 was using. 3 Q Well, what if we set the TDP to one side and 4 simply said, Dr. Whitehouse, I want to know whether 5 you've determined based upon scientific study that 6 there's a difference in the presentation of diffuse 7 pleural thickening at Libby versus elsewhere. Forget 8 about the TDP. I just want to know whether you've 9 determined that the presentation is different than 10 Libby elsewhere. Could you tell me that what you've 11 seen in Libby in terms of the thickness of the pleura 12 on presentation or severe diffuse pleural thickening 13 is different from that same feature reported in the 14 literature? 15 A Yes, much more frequent. 16 Q Not frequent. 17 A Hey, that counts for a whole lot. 18 Q I'm not -- 19 A You have to look at it that way. 20 Q No, no, no, no, no, no, no. I just want -- I 21 want you to tease out here -- very important -- how 22 it looks. 23 Do you know -- do you know based upon 24 scientific data that the presentation of diffuse 25 pleural thickening at Libby is different in terms of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 269</p> <p>1 exposure outside of Libby? Have you determined that 2 scientifically? 3 A No, it hasn't been reported yet. 4 Q It hasn't? 5 A It hasn't been reported. 6 Q When it comes to the frequency of blunting of 7 costophrenic angle, Libby versus outside of Libby, 8 have you determined scientifically that the rate of 9 reporting outside of Libby is different? 10 A Well, the literature indicates that -- not 11 the literature, but the Amelia* article, et al., says 12 that you shouldn't have diffuse pleural -- they call 13 it diffuse pleural thickening and it's -- 14 Q I know. 15 A But that's -- 16 MR. LEWIS: Now you've got to let him 17 finish his answer. 18 MR. BERNICK: Come on. Come on, Tom. 19 MR. LEWIS: No. Wait. Wait. Wait. 20 MR. BERNICK: We've been getting along 21 fine. 22 MR. LEWIS: Wait. Wait. Wait. 23 MR. BERNICK: We've been getting along 24 just fine. 25 MR. LEWIS: That's because you were not</p>

68 (Pages 266 to 269)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 270</p> <p>1 interrupting his answers. Let him finish his answer 2 and then you can inquire. 3 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Go ahead, Dr. Whitehouse. 4 A The Amelia article indicates -- or Amelio*, 5 whatever it is, a Frenchman's article a couple of 6 years ago indicates that you shouldn't call diffuse 7 pleural thickening unless there's blunting of the 8 angle. Okay? Well, we know clearly from our CT 9 scans that we've got an awful lot of people with 10 diffuse pleural thickening without blunted angles, 11 and so it's contrary to what's reported in the 12 literature. 13 Q You done? 14 A Yeah, I'm done. 15 Q Now, I'm not -- my -- my question had nothing 16 to do with the definition adopted by Dr. Amelia. 17 Nothing. I'm totally focused on data. 18 Have you determined scientifically that the 19 rate of reporting for severe diffuse pleural 20 thickening at Libby without blunting of the 21 costophrenic angle is different from the data that's 22 reported in the literature outside of Libby? 23 A Well, you know, we haven't reported it. We 24 haven't had the opportunity to. 25 Q No, but do you know that what you've seen at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 272</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: Objection. 2 MR. BERNICK: Just make your objection. 3 I'm going to ask the question. 4 MR. LEWIS: I thought you were -- 5 MR. BERNICK: Do you want to make the 6 objection? 7 MR. LEWIS: I thought you were done. 8 MR. BERNICK: Go make the objection. 9 MR. LEWIS: No, I thought you were 10 finished with your question. 11 MR. BERNICK: No. 12 MR. LEWIS: All right. Go ahead and 13 finish your question and then I'll make my objection. 14 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So I want to know whether 15 you scientifically determined that the rate of 16 reporting of severe diffuse pleural thickening at 17 Libby without blunting is higher than the data shows 18 for severe diffuse pleural thickening without 19 blunting outside of Libby. 20 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Object to the 21 form of the question. The question is clearly 22 compound. It asks several questions. 23 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Go ahead. 24 A It's obvious if Amelia is reporting that 25 there's no diffuse pleural thickening. You -- the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 271</p> <p>1 Libby is different in frequency from what has been 2 scientifically reported outside of Libby when it 3 comes to blunting? 4 A Yes, I do know that, but on the other hand, 5 you're -- every time I've tried to testify about 6 things that I reported or I've seen in Libby relative 7 to what's going on outside, you tell me you want to 8 know if I've reported anything or seen scientific 9 data, and what I'm telling you is these are my own 10 observations. 11 Q Yeah, but we're -- we're -- we're 12 communicating kind of, but not completely here. I 13 just want to be totally clear, so that there's no 14 confusion. 15 You've got data that you have at Libby. I've 16 tried to unpack the data that you have at Libby. 17 Some of it we've got, some of it we don't have, but 18 we've had the opportunity to find out about some of 19 it today, so I understand Libby. 20 I'm asking now about whether you know that 21 the experience in Libby is, in fact, different from 22 the experience outside of Libby, and in order to find 23 out about that, I'm asking about how your Libby data 24 compares to data reported in the scientific 25 literature outside of Libby.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 273</p> <p>1 powers that be have created a definition for diffuse 2 pleural thickening that excludes diffuse pleural 3 thickening unless the angle is blunted -- 4 Q Which -- 5 A -- and I'm telling you by all our 6 measurements, we've got about half of ours with 7 severe diffuse pleural thickening that don't have 8 blunting. 9 Q I understand. 10 A That's the answer to the question. 11 Q No, it's not. 12 A There's no other answer. 13 Q No, because all you've told me about is the 14 authorities on high and a definition in the Amelia 15 paper. There are many papers that have been reported 16 that have been published on diffuse pleural 17 thickening that have not required blunting of the 18 costophrenic angle to include people in their 19 reports. That was a later development that took 20 place. 21 McCloud took place before that development. 22 Sargent* took place before that development. There 23 are a whole series of papers that were written before 24 people incorporated into the definition blunting of 25 the costophrenic angle.</p>

69 (Pages 270 to 273)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 274</p> <p>1 So what I want to know is: Can you -- do you</p> <p>2 have scientific data on the basis of which you could</p> <p>3 say the rate at which diffuse pleural thickening has</p> <p>4 been found, severe, without blunting at Libby is</p> <p>5 different from the rate that appears in the</p> <p>6 scientific literature outside of Libby for severe</p> <p>7 diffuse pleural thickening without blunting?</p> <p>8 MR. LEWIS: Well, objection. That</p> <p>9 assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>10 A Let me answer the question first. Obviously,</p> <p>11 the ILO said that those doctors were wrong, that that</p> <p>12 wasn't diffuse pleural thickening. It can't be</p> <p>13 diffuse pleural thickening. There's no blunting, so</p> <p>14 they were obviously wrong. Amelia's right. We're</p> <p>15 right with -- with your plan here. No, that's --</p> <p>16 that's clearly the answer because when they changed</p> <p>17 the ILO standards and said you can't have diffuse</p> <p>18 pleural thickening without blunting, they basically</p> <p>19 said to the guys before them, you guys were wrong.</p> <p>20 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I don't --</p> <p>21 A That's the answer to it.</p> <p>22 Q Well, that may be your interpretation, but I</p> <p>23 want to know data.</p> <p>24 A I don't know what, if any, of that data is in</p> <p>25 any of that. I don't know what it is. I'm not very</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 276</p> <p>1 Libby, do you know that that is -- do you know</p> <p>2 scientifically that that is unique to Libby?</p> <p>3 A Well, you know, obviously, McCloud's report</p> <p>4 is chrysotile outside of Libby.</p> <p>5 Q Outside Libby?</p> <p>6 A Sure.</p> <p>7 Q And so that would be consistent, that is,</p> <p>8 what he observed outside of Libby with respect to low</p> <p>9 exposure is consistent with what you observed at</p> <p>10 Libby with respect to low exposure, correct?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Now, when we talk about progression --</p> <p>13 when we talk about progression, you've got cases</p> <p>14 involving progression that are in your report and</p> <p>15 it's the eighteen in tab six of Exhibit-1 to this</p> <p>16 deposition, and you've told us we've got to go back</p> <p>17 and take a look at the files, and if we have, we</p> <p>18 will, but I want to know on the basis of what test</p> <p>19 you can say that the rapid progression that you've</p> <p>20 observed at Libby for severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>21 thickening is different from the progression that's</p> <p>22 been observed outside of Libby on the basis of what</p> <p>23 test you say Libby is different from non-Libby.</p> <p>24 A The rapidity of it.</p> <p>25 Q Yeah, but measured how? I want to know what</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 275</p> <p>1 interested in it and I don't know what the data</p> <p>2 was --</p> <p>3 Q What about --</p> <p>4 A -- what the percentage was. I know what</p> <p>5 McCloud's was. It was about 45 percent.</p> <p>6 Q Right, which is comparable to what you found,</p> <p>7 right?</p> <p>8 A Yeah, it is.</p> <p>9 Q Okay.</p> <p>10 A But he basically was told, you're wrong,</p> <p>11 because it's -- that's not the way it works.</p> <p>12 Q So at least will you agree with me that</p> <p>13 the -- that you can say that with respect to McCloud,</p> <p>14 he found a comparable rate of severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>15 thickening without blunting is what you found in</p> <p>16 Libby, correct?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And do you have any reason to believe that --</p> <p>19 do you believe his data is wrong?</p> <p>20 A No, I don't believe his data is wrong. I</p> <p>21 think Amelia's data is probably wrong.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Now, when it comes to -- when it comes</p> <p>23 to exposure outside of Libby, would you say the same</p> <p>24 thing, that is, you found severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>25 thickening associated with low -- low exposures at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 277</p> <p>1 measurement you used to say that the rapidity of</p> <p>2 Libby is different from the rapidity outside of</p> <p>3 Libby.</p> <p>4 A Well, the literature, not only in general,</p> <p>5 but all the literature indicates it's a slow</p> <p>6 progressive disease and all of it's directed towards</p> <p>7 that. And this sort of phenomenon, to my knowledge,</p> <p>8 has not been reported in the literature.</p> <p>9 Q Have you looked to see --</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Have you looked --</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q -- for the data on progression of severe</p> <p>14 diffuse pleural thickening outside of Libby? Have</p> <p>15 you looked for it?</p> <p>16 A Well, first off, this -- I didn't say this</p> <p>17 was serve disease. I didn't say this progressed to</p> <p>18 severe pleural thickening. That was your term.</p> <p>19 Q And that's pointing to Exhibit-6 of</p> <p>20 Exhibit-1 --</p> <p>21 A I didn't say that.</p> <p>22 Q -- is that right?</p> <p>23 A It's your term. You made that assumption. I</p> <p>24 just said they rapidly progressed.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Well, then I will -- then I will</p>

70 (Pages 274 to 277)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 278</p> <p>1 clarify that too.</p> <p>2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Counsel, we need to</p> <p>3 switch out tapes.</p> <p>4 MR. BERNICK: We're almost done.</p> <p>5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the</p> <p>6 record. The time is now 3:19 p.m. This is the end</p> <p>7 of disk number three in the continuing deposition of</p> <p>8 Alan Whitehouse.</p> <p>9 (Recess.)</p> <p>10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the</p> <p>11 record. The time is now 3:24 p.m. This is the</p> <p>12 beginning of disk number four in the continuing</p> <p>13 deposition of Dr. Alan Whitehouse.</p> <p>14 EXAMINATION (Continuing)</p> <p>15 BY MR. BERNICK:</p> <p>16 Q So, Dr. Whitehouse, I think where we broke</p> <p>17 off I was asking about progression and then you</p> <p>18 clarified that tab six of Exhibit-1 is not</p> <p>19 necessarily progression to or associated with severe</p> <p>20 diffuse pleural thickening, fair?</p> <p>21 A That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q And so where is your data that says that</p> <p>23 severe diffuse pleural thickening shows more rapid</p> <p>24 progression in Libby than what the literature reports</p> <p>25 outside of Libby?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 280</p> <p>1 order to be able to explain, fair?</p> <p>2 A Well, yeah, clearly they -- they markedly</p> <p>3 increased their pleura disease associated with their</p> <p>4 loss of lung function, at least all but one, and one</p> <p>5 was purely interstitial.</p> <p>6 Q So --</p> <p>7 A But whether or not you would say when you</p> <p>8 look at them whether they'd gone from three to five</p> <p>9 millimeters or one to three or what, I can't -- I</p> <p>10 can't recall how many of them actually went to what</p> <p>11 you would call severe pleural disease.</p> <p>12 Q So you can't say on the basis of this that</p> <p>13 they had a rapid -- a more rapid progression. This</p> <p>14 is really what I'm getting at. There are two issues.</p> <p>15 The first issue is what you actually say is reflected</p> <p>16 in tab six to Exhibit-1 by way of progression.</p> <p>17 And what you've been able to tell us is that</p> <p>18 there's rapid progression, but you've not been able</p> <p>19 to tell us exactly the test that you used in saying</p> <p>20 that there's been rapid progression in these</p> <p>21 particular cases, fair?</p> <p>22 A You're not talking about pulmonary function</p> <p>23 tests here, you're talking about a test like the</p> <p>24 radiographs or something?</p> <p>25 Q No, I'm -- again, this is you, not me. This</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 279</p> <p>1 A You know, I don't think that I've actually</p> <p>2 said exactly that. What I've said is that we have</p> <p>3 people that have rapidly progressed their pleural</p> <p>4 disease which falls into this category here. Most of</p> <p>5 these people do have fairly severe disease or at</p> <p>6 least they did by the end of this. They had very bad</p> <p>7 disease and several of them have died from their</p> <p>8 pleural disease, so I guess you can draw that</p> <p>9 inference, although I haven't made a great issue out</p> <p>10 of that.</p> <p>11 Also, some of the people in the mortality</p> <p>12 study were people in my practice that I followed for</p> <p>13 a while and then went ahead and got significantly</p> <p>14 worse over, you know, a relatively short period of</p> <p>15 time, although they were already very sick beforehand</p> <p>16 and went ahead and died, so I don't know that I have</p> <p>17 any data concerning that except that I know very well</p> <p>18 from -- this is probably the best data I have except</p> <p>19 that I don't have it real collated so I could show</p> <p>20 you all the radiographs and the pleural thickness and</p> <p>21 things yet.</p> <p>22 Q So today if we focused on tab six to</p> <p>23 Exhibit-1, you say that these people reflect rapid</p> <p>24 progression, but exactly how and -- how they do that</p> <p>25 is something that you would need the patient files in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 281</p> <p>1 is your opinions. You've said that tab six to</p> <p>2 Exhibit-1 reflects progression and I have asked,</p> <p>3 well, with respect to severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>4 thickening, how does the data in tab six show a rapid</p> <p>5 progression in diffuse -- severe diffuse pleural</p> <p>6 thickening, and you said this is not focused</p> <p>7 specifically on that question, right?</p> <p>8 A That's right.</p> <p>9 Q So I then said, well, what was the test,</p> <p>10 how -- whatever you were doing with tab six, what was</p> <p>11 your test of progression? And if you can answer</p> <p>12 that, that would be great. What was your test of</p> <p>13 progression for the matters that are set forth in tab</p> <p>14 six of Exhibit-1?</p> <p>15 A Okay. Except for case ten, where I only have</p> <p>16 one set of pulmonary functions, but had a lot of</p> <p>17 x-rays from before, it was a combination of both the</p> <p>18 x-ray and the pulmonary function. The x-ray had</p> <p>19 shown progression of pulmonary -- of pleural disease</p> <p>20 and the pulmonary functions at the same time had</p> <p>21 shown a decline consistent with the kind of x-ray</p> <p>22 changes, I would say.</p> <p>23 Q And exactly how you worked with those things</p> <p>24 in each of these cases, we'd have to have a file in</p> <p>25 order to explore that with you, fair?</p>

71 (Pages 278 to 281)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 282</p> <p>1 A Yeah.</p> <p>2 Q Okay.</p> <p>3 A If you have the file, I'll be happy to</p> <p>4 discuss it with you.</p> <p>5 Q Okay.</p> <p>6 A This is very clear cut when you look at the</p> <p>7 x-rays and the chart.</p> <p>8 Q But you can't articulate it verbally as we</p> <p>9 sit here?</p> <p>10 A Exactly for each one, no, I can't.</p> <p>11 Q Okay.</p> <p>12 A I mean, I can for some of them, if you'd like</p> <p>13 me to.</p> <p>14 Q No, I want to -- I'd like a rule or a test.</p> <p>15 I mean, was there any one test or rule or was</p> <p>16 this a matter of different factors for different</p> <p>17 people?</p> <p>18 A Well, there was sometimes different factors</p> <p>19 and the paper will reflect the various different</p> <p>20 factors that went into that.</p> <p>21 Q And that's the paper that you have in draft</p> <p>22 form?</p> <p>23 A That's the paper that I've got in a draft,</p> <p>24 but I haven't -- it isn't anywhere near ready for</p> <p>25 publication.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 284</p> <p>1 progression over decades or progression with small</p> <p>2 amounts, but not to this degree.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Well, then, you tell me how -- exactly</p> <p>4 how -- not just, you know, generally, but you tell me</p> <p>5 exactly how the progression that you've observed is</p> <p>6 reflected in tab six is different from the</p> <p>7 progression of severe diffuse pleural thickening in</p> <p>8 specific data in the literature. I want to know the</p> <p>9 data in the literature which you're pointing to that</p> <p>10 says you say scientifically is different from the</p> <p>11 data that you have in Libby. I want to know that</p> <p>12 precisely. That's what I'm getting at.</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Compound</p> <p>14 question.</p> <p>15 Q (By Mr. Bernick) So my question to you is:</p> <p>16 What precisely is the difference between the data</p> <p>17 that you report in here at tab six and the data that</p> <p>18 you see reported in the external literature, and what</p> <p>19 literature are you referring to?</p> <p>20 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Compound</p> <p>21 question.</p> <p>22 A The -- the extent of the loss rates in this</p> <p>23 is much higher. I mean, the loss rates that you see</p> <p>24 in the literature is going to be one or two percent.</p> <p>25 The highest one I've seen is about two percent in the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 283</p> <p>1 Q But to be clear, you're not -- you can't say</p> <p>2 scientifically that the progression that you've</p> <p>3 observed in tab six is different from what is</p> <p>4 reported scientifically in the literature for</p> <p>5 progression of severe diffuse pleural thickening in</p> <p>6 the scientific literature, can you?</p> <p>7 A I think it actually is. I think this has not</p> <p>8 been reported.</p> <p>9 Q Well, but this data has not been reported,</p> <p>10 tab six?</p> <p>11 A No, no, this phenomenon has not been</p> <p>12 reported.</p> <p>13 Q But you can't -- I mean, have you actually</p> <p>14 investigated the scientific --</p> <p>15 A Yeah.</p> <p>16 Q -- literature --</p> <p>17 A Yeah, we have.</p> <p>18 Q -- to look for progression in the scientific</p> <p>19 literature?</p> <p>20 A Oh, yeah. Looked at lots of progression</p> <p>21 articles in the scientific literature and</p> <p>22 particularly related to amphiboles which, of course,</p> <p>23 this is.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So --</p> <p>25 A And have not -- I've discovered slow gradual</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 285</p> <p>1 DLCO from Australia per year. Okay? These are --</p> <p>2 you know, we're looking at 10, 15, 20 percent per</p> <p>3 year in these people.</p> <p>4 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Okay.</p> <p>5 A But those -- those studies do not have any</p> <p>6 real radiography that goes along with them and I've</p> <p>7 looked at a number of these and there isn't anything</p> <p>8 that comes comparatively close to this.</p> <p>9 Q These -- these are a total of 22 people or</p> <p>10 thereabouts?</p> <p>11 A Yeah, thereabouts. It's going to get</p> <p>12 whittled down some, but --</p> <p>13 Q How did you pick them?</p> <p>14 A Oh, just these were people that I saw that --</p> <p>15 you know, I saw in the clinic or Brad had seen in the</p> <p>16 clinic and, you know, they came in because they were</p> <p>17 getting more short of breath and looked at things</p> <p>18 sequentially and their x-rays and all and, indeed,</p> <p>19 had a good reason for it.</p> <p>20 Q Yeah, but this is a very small subgroup of</p> <p>21 your patients, correct?</p> <p>22 A Oh, it is a small -- no, no, I didn't say it</p> <p>23 happens to everybody by any means. I'm -- there's</p> <p>24 going to be more of them and this took a couple of</p> <p>25 years to collect this.</p>

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 286</p> <p>1 Q But -- but did you pick them out -- did you 2 pick them out -- well, strike that. 3 Progression is something that you can look 4 for throughout your patient population, right? 5 A Sure. 6 Q And if we looked for progression for people 7 who have a non-malignant disease in your whole 8 patient population and we gathered all the data, 9 would we see a pattern of progression that's 10 different from what we see in the literature? 11 A Probably. With other diseases, you mean? 12 Q With other non-malignant diseases. Your 13 non-malignant disease population at Libby. 14 A Sure. 15 Q If we took a non-malignant disease population 16 outside of Libby and we said how have they 17 progressed, Libby, non-Libby, would you see an 18 overall pattern of progression in Libby that is 19 different from progression outside of Libby? 20 A Well, to my knowledge this is not described 21 in -- outside Libby either. There are diseases that 22 progress rapidly that are non-malignant. Emphysema 23 can do that. Emphysema will progress -- 24 Q Well -- 25 A -- quite rapidly.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 288</p> <p>1 progressive disease. Now, that's not to say that 2 they don't have some and they haven't published it. 3 I have no idea. 4 Q Well, but that's the whole point is that if 5 you had done a study that included not just the most 6 significant or pronounced cases at Libby, but the 7 broader population, that would then be comparable to 8 studies outside of Libby working with larger 9 populations, right? 10 A No, because I think that anybody that was 11 dealing with this on a regular basis that wrote 12 papers or was in a research facility or whatever it 13 is would take note of this and write this up -- 14 Q I didn't -- Dr. Whitehouse -- 15 A -- in a separate paper, not as -- 16 Q That is -- that's a what or a would or a 17 maybe. I just really want to know what we know. 18 Okay? 19 A Well, it's no more of a would or a maybe than 20 what you said. 21 Q No, not at all. I'm asking for a fact. 22 If you take -- if you want to make a 23 comparison of Libby, non-Libby, you have to have 24 studies that are comparable in scope, right? 25 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 287</p> <p>1 Q I'm -- you picked out 18 cases or 22 cases, 2 right? 3 A Well, they sort of picked themselves out. 4 Q Right, but they are -- they are a very small 5 subgroup of the total population of people that 6 you've seen with non-malignant disease at Libby, 7 right? 8 A That's true. 9 Q And, indeed, they are the ones who are 10 probably most dramatic and pronounced when it comes 11 to progression, correct? 12 A That's correct. 13 Q Now, if you go to the populations outside of 14 Libby where you say the progression has been slower, 15 are they these very select populations like yours 16 here, 18, 22 people selected or are they larger 17 groups of people? 18 A Well, you know, this is a selection of 22 out 19 of the whole clinic population. The studies that 20 I've seen, particularly from Australia which I read 21 on a fairly regular basis because there are many 22 similar problems that they have, they have very large 23 case studies here and most of their studies -- not 24 most of them, all the studies that I've seen out of 25 there related to progression relate to slowly</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 289</p> <p>1 Q I'm sorry? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Okay. And so if you have a study inside of 4 Libby that's a large population of people with 5 non-malignant disease and you want -- and you ask 6 what's progression like and you record the result, if 7 you want to know whether the same thing is true 8 outside of Libby, you'd have to have a study that 9 picks out a large population and the study is done in 10 the same way, right, apples and apples? 11 A Yeah. 12 Q Okay. Here you have a study in Libby and 13 it's not a big group, it's a small group, and it was 14 a group that was picked precisely because they picked 15 themselves, in your own words, the rapid progression. 16 If you want to know whether that's unique to Libby, 17 you'd have to look for a comparable study outside of 18 Libby, right? 19 A Right, nobody's published it. 20 Q And so -- but it's not that you know it's 21 unique to Libby, it's that you haven't seen a study 22 like this outside of Libby, correct? 23 A Yeah, but, you know, I don't have x-ray 24 vision to know whether they actually have it and 25 haven't published it, so if they haven't published</p>

73 (Pages 286 to 289)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 290</p> <p>1 it, the likelihood is that they haven't seen it.</p> <p>2 Q Well, but that is -- that is an inference on</p> <p>3 your part. All you know is that you have a highly</p> <p>4 select group of people where you've made this</p> <p>5 observation at Libby and you're not aware of a</p> <p>6 comparable study outside of Libby, fair?</p> <p>7 A That's true.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Now, if we talk about -- for a moment</p> <p>9 about a comparable group within Libby, that is, if</p> <p>10 you were looking for a larger group at Libby to</p> <p>11 compare it to the larger groups outside of Libby, you</p> <p>12 said that the larger groups outside of Libby with</p> <p>13 non-malignant disease reflect gradual loss, fair?</p> <p>14 A Generally.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. There are studies that have been done</p> <p>16 of larger groups of people at Libby, correct?</p> <p>17 A At Libby, you said?</p> <p>18 Q At Libby.</p> <p>19 A They haven't -- not on loss of pulmonary</p> <p>20 function.</p> <p>21 Q Sure, your progression study.</p> <p>22 A Oh, my study, yeah.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. So if they took a look at your study</p> <p>24 that you published in 2004, that's a study of a</p> <p>25 larger group of people, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 292</p> <p>1 A No, I didn't. I just took all-comers.</p> <p>2 Q All-comers?</p> <p>3 A When they had their second pulmonary function</p> <p>4 and everybody got a second pulmonary function, so</p> <p>5 there was no bias in selection.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. So the 2004 progression study that you</p> <p>7 did was an all-comers, no selection, no bias study,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A Right.</p> <p>10 Q And that's comparable apples and apples with</p> <p>11 large group studies outside of Libby that you've</p> <p>12 looked at and found the slow progression, correct?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Whereas, this -- this paper that's not yet</p> <p>15 published is not an all-comers paper, it's a select</p> <p>16 group?</p> <p>17 A It is a select group. Perfectly willing to</p> <p>18 admit that.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. And that's what's reflected in tab six</p> <p>20 to Exhibit-1, correct?</p> <p>21 A Mm-hm, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Now, if we take a look at your 2004 paper,</p> <p>23 you had the all-comers group, but you only looked at</p> <p>24 two data points, correct?</p> <p>25 A That's true.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 291</p> <p>1 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>2 Q I'm sorry?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And that would be a good place to go if you</p> <p>5 wanted to see is the experience at Libby different</p> <p>6 from the experience outside of Libby because that's</p> <p>7 the study that's working with a larger group of</p> <p>8 people just like the larger group of people outside</p> <p>9 of Libby, correct?</p> <p>10 A That's exactly what it showed, that it was</p> <p>11 higher than the --</p> <p>12 Q We'll get to what it showed. Just answer the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 A -- prior published studies.</p> <p>15 Q Please just answer the question.</p> <p>16 Is the study that you did in 2004 on a larger</p> <p>17 group of people a good place to go for an apples and</p> <p>18 apples comparison with studies of progression in</p> <p>19 large groups of people outside of Libby?</p> <p>20 A Yes, probably.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Now, when you did the study in 2004,</p> <p>22 you picked out people and you looked for progression,</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q How did you pick out --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 293</p> <p>1 Q And, in fact, if we look at that all-comers</p> <p>2 group, it turns out that many of them had many more</p> <p>3 data points, correct?</p> <p>4 A I took the first one that I had and the last</p> <p>5 one that I had when I was doing the study and they</p> <p>6 had more data points later on. No question they had</p> <p>7 more data points. There were also some people that</p> <p>8 got into a study with Enbrel* and that -- I did not</p> <p>9 take them because of that.</p> <p>10 Q Didn't ask you that question with all due</p> <p>11 respect, Dr. Whitehouse.</p> <p>12 MR. LEWIS: Doctor, just try to answer</p> <p>13 the questions that counsel is asking you. Okay?</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I thought I was.</p> <p>15 Q (By Mr. Bernick) I know. That's okay, but</p> <p>16 let's just keep on going ahead.</p> <p>17 The 2004 study, you used only two data points</p> <p>18 with respect to each of the individuals in that</p> <p>19 study, correct?</p> <p>20 A Yeah.</p> <p>21 Q And isn't it true that there were many more</p> <p>22 data points that were available to be used in that</p> <p>23 study beyond those two data points?</p> <p>24 A No, because I cut it off at a certain point,</p> <p>25 put the data together and ignored everything that</p>

74 (Pages 290 to 293)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 294</p> <p>1 went on afterwards. That wasn't germane to the 2 study. It was the first and last. 3 Q Will you agree with me that with respect to 4 all those people, there were many other data points 5 that were available, it was your decision not to use 6 them? 7 A No, they weren't available when I wrote the 8 paper. 9 Q Oh. 10 A That's what I said. 11 Q They weren't available when you wrote the 12 paper? 13 A Because they hadn't been done yet. 14 Q Oh, they hadn't been done yet, okay. 15 So now if we took a look at these people who 16 were in the 123 study -- 123 study in 2004, that same 17 population, and we looked to all of the data that's 18 available on their progression, have you done that 19 analysis? 20 A I have not. 21 Q Isn't it a fact that if we looked to the 22 other data points with respect to the people in your 23 2004 study, we'd find dramatically different 24 progression numbers from which you put in the paper? 25 A I do not know that at all. I doubt that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 296</p> <p>1 A You could examine data up until the present 2 time. You could continue to examine data. 3 Q Sure. 4 A But there's no point. 5 Q Okay. But you haven't done that examination 6 of data? 7 A No, and I don't intend to. 8 Q Have you ever done a progression study with 9 respect to non-malignant disease in all 950 -- 10 A No. 11 Q -- of the people that you've looked at? 12 A No. 13 Q There's no reason you couldn't do it, 14 correct? 15 A No, and it will be done. 16 Q Let's talk about progression to death. That 17 was the other thing that you said was distinctive in 18 connection with the Libby population. 19 Are you aware of any comparable study that's 20 been done of progression outside of Libby? 21 A Progression in general? 22 Q No. You say that the Libby experience with 23 non-malignant disease, severe -- I'm all focused on 24 severe diffuse pleural thickening -- is different 25 because of the rate of the frequency of progression</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 295</p> <p>1 seriously. 2 Q Would that be an important thing to do to 3 find out the truth of what happened with those 4 people, to look at all the data rather than just two 5 points? 6 A Well, it'll be a little bit hard to do 7 because about 40 of them have died already. Between 8 35 and 40. 9 Q Not at all. 10 A What? 11 Q No, because even with respect to those 12 people, you'd have more data before they died. 13 A You know, there isn't any point to doing 14 that. 15 Q Why? 16 A The study was done honestly. It was done -- 17 Q I'm not -- 18 A -- looking clearly at those studies and -- 19 Q There's no dispute about that. 20 A Okay. 21 Q I'm not saying there was -- I'm not saying 22 anything else. I'm saying if you wanted to know more 23 of the truth of what happened to the people in your 24 all-comers study in 2004, there's more data that 25 could be examined, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 297</p> <p>1 to death. Do you remember that? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Okay. And I'm just asking whether you've 4 actually looked for comparable data outside of Libby 5 to know whether it really is unique to Libby. Have 6 you done that? 7 A For progression of death, no. 8 Q Okay. Now, in progression to death in the 9 case of the Libby data that you have, my 10 understanding -- and I want to get a little bit into 11 this and I've got one more -- a few set of questions 12 and then I'm done, get out of here, take an airplane. 13 Okay? 14 So in the case of Libby, as I understand it 15 with respect to the CARD mortality study, you had a 16 patient population of people who had died and you 17 performed this analysis to determine the 18 circumstances leading to their death and we got down 19 to a subgroup of about 76 people who you say had 20 non-malignant respiratory disease and they progressed 21 and they died, right? 22 A Yes. 23 Q And that's what you rely upon as your source 24 of information to say that the people in Libby with 25 non-malignant respiratory disease progressed to death</p>

75 (Pages 294 to 297)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 298</p> <p>1 with greater frequency than would be the case outside 2 of Libby, correct? 3 A Correct. 4 Q Okay. Now, as part of that exercise, you 5 looked at the death certificates, right? 6 A Yes. 7 Q But you also had this procedure called best 8 available information, right? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And this best available information procedure 11 that you applied, you felt, had precedence in 12 Selikoff's own work, correct? 13 A Had precedence? 14 Q Yes. 15 A It was sort of an additive more than a 16 precedence. 17 Q Well, but, see, that you felt there was a 18 precedent for what you're -- 19 A Oh, I see. 20 Q -- doing. 21 A I see what you're talking about. I'm sorry. 22 Q Yeah. There's precedent for what you were 23 doing in Selikoff's work, correct? 24 A Yeah, I think so. As best I can tell, we try 25 to replicate that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 300</p> <p>1 analysis? 2 A Not that I'm aware of. 3 Q Okay. Now, in connection with your own best 4 available information analysis that was done in 5 connection with the CARD mortality study, was there a 6 written protocol? 7 A No. 8 Q Dr. Frank said that in the Selikoff work, he 9 said that there was a death certificate available for 10 all of the people who were involved in Selikoff's 11 mortality study. Was that your understanding? 12 A Yes, it is. 13 Q And he explained to us that a death 14 certificate will have two sources -- two pieces of 15 information about the cause of death. One is the 16 immediate -- temporally immediate cause of death and 17 the other is the cause of death, that is, an 18 assessment about what the real cause of death was. 19 Is that your understanding of how death certificates 20 are supposed to be filled out? 21 A That's how they're supposed to be filled out, 22 but that's probably the biggest failure of physicians 23 is filling out death certificates. 24 Q Right. 25 And he also said that when Selikoff did the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 299</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And Selikoff's work, you also got 2 information on what Selikoff had done and his best 3 available information analysis, you had information 4 from Dr. Frank, right? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. Now, Dr. Frank told us that 7 Dr. Selikoff did this best available information work 8 and he said that there was no written protocol for 9 it. Is that consistent with your understanding? 10 A I think so, although I know they did use sort 11 of a protocol as to what they did. When you read the 12 paper, they sort of tell you how they went about 13 doing it. Whether that's a protocol or not, I don't 14 know. 15 Q But are you aware of any written protocol 16 that was actually used by Dr. Selikoff in his work on 17 best available information? 18 A No. 19 Q Okay. Are you aware of any other -- are you 20 aware of any protocol that exists in the field of 21 scientific research for mortality studies that is a 22 best available information protocol? In other words, 23 can we look anywhere and find in the literature on 24 mortality studies a protocol or an established 25 methodology for doing a best available information</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 301</p> <p>1 best available information assessment that the 2 criteria or what was being looked for didn't change. 3 They were looking for the best or the cause of death, 4 what the real cause of death was, not the condition 5 immediately preceding death, but the real cause of 6 death. Is that your understanding of -- 7 A Yes. 8 Q -- how Selikoff did his BAI or best available 9 information analysis? 10 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 11 Q I'm sorry? 12 A Yes, I agree. 13 Q Okay. Now, when it came time for doing the 14 best available information assessment in the case of 15 your work on the mortality -- the CARD mortality 16 data, it's true, is it not, that you determined what 17 the -- in the sense, the cause that you were looking 18 for should be, that is, you determined whether you 19 were going to look for a substantial contributing 20 factor to death or the cause of death, that was your 21 decision? 22 A It was looked -- both of those were looked 23 at. 24 Q I'm sorry? 25 A Both of those were looked at.</p>

76 (Pages 298 to 301)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 302</p> <p>1 Q When it came to defining what to look for in 2 the CARD mortality data regarding cause of death, the 3 test that was to be applied was your decision, right? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Okay. And you've told us that two different 6 tests were used. In the first analysis, the test for 7 determining the cause -- for determining cause of 8 death in the mortality data, the test was, was 9 asbestos a substantial contributing factor, or words 10 to that effect, correct? 11 A Correct. 12 Q And on the basis of that, you gathered 13 information regarding these 79 people who had 14 non-malignant disease and died, right? 15 A Right. 16 Q And then you changed the test in the second 17 go-round and what was the test in the second 18 go-round? 19 A Best available information. 20 Q Best available information regarding what? 21 Whether asbestos was a contributing cause or was it 22 whether the asbestos related to disease was the cause 23 of death? 24 A Yeah, what we did was -- there were a lot of 25 people that had -- or not a lot, but there were</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 304</p> <p>1 A Correct. 2 Q What was the test they satisfied, that is, 3 are the people on Exhibit-15 people with respect to 4 whom asbestos-related illness was a substantial 5 contributing factor to death, a major causative 6 factor for death, the cause -- the cause of death? 7 What was the test that was used in putting people in 8 the group of 79 that's in Exhibit-15? 9 A I already answered that. It was the last 10 two. 11 Q The last two? 12 A It was either directly asbestosis or it was 13 the asbestosis was so severe that they had something 14 like a pneumonia so that the cause of death may have 15 been pneumonia because a lot of those underlying -- 16 and it said asbestosis or if it -- you know, the 17 death certificate said something like COPD, which it 18 did several times, we went and looked through the 19 whole chart and found out that they had severe 20 asbestosis, they didn't even have COPD, and that's 21 been a common problem in Libby for years and years. 22 Q But -- but my question -- 23 A So it was -- it was a direct result of the 24 asbestosis or we wouldn't have coded it that way. 25 Q Well, that's really what I'm getting at.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 303</p> <p>1 people that had a contributing cause where they 2 had -- we knew they had significant asbestosis, but 3 when we really came right down to it in the nitty 4 gritty, we couldn't be sure if they wouldn't have 5 died of their disease of whatever they had at that 6 point, whether it was asbestosis or whatever it was. 7 To use asbestosis as a piece of information, 8 that it was a major causative factor in their death, 9 we had to look at the severity of their disease, how 10 it was affecting them at the time, what happened to 11 them as the terminal event, and whether it could be 12 related either directly to the asbestosis or if the 13 terminal event was such that they couldn't survive it 14 because of their asbestosis. 15 Q Okay. So let's get this to the bottom line. 16 The people that you rely upon for your 17 opinions regarding progression to death for 18 non-malignant disease are the people that are listed 19 in Exhibit-15, it's those people there, the 79 20 people, right? 21 A Right. 22 Q And those 79 people are people who satisfied 23 the best -- the BAI test, the best available 24 information test with respect to non-malignant 25 asbestos disease, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 305</p> <p>1 On the death certificate, it's supposed to 2 be -- we heard from Dr. Frank it's supposed to be the 3 cause of death, right? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Did you apply that test and that test only -- 6 A No. 7 Q -- in deciding -- so just let me finish my 8 question. 9 Did you apply that test and that test only, 10 that is, the cause of death including people on 11 Exhibit-15 that is within your 79 group or was there 12 some other test as well? 13 A No, ultimately, it wasn't the death 14 certificate because the death certificates were so 15 frequently wrong. 16 Q I'm not talking about death certificates. 17 A It was reviewing the entire chart. 18 Q I know. 19 A Well, then I don't get your question. 20 Q Okay. That's fine. 21 I know that you could either go with the 22 death certificate or go with more information or go 23 with both. I know that. But, ultimately, the 24 information that you're gathering has to be judged 25 according to some test, and we know that the test</p>

77 (Pages 302 to 305)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 306</p> <p>1 that's supposed to be used for filling out a death 2 certificate is the test of, well, what was the cause 3 of death, and Dr. Frank has told us that and I think 4 you've agreed, right? 5 A Yeah. 6 Q And Dr. Frank says when Selikoff did his BAI 7 work, he looked for more information that was on the 8 death certificate, but the test was still the same, 9 that is, what was the cause of death, so I'm now 10 asking in the case of your work with the CARD 11 mortality data and including people in your group of 12 79 people who are people where you say their death 13 was in some fashion related to non-malignant disease. 14 I'm asking for what tests you used. 15 Was it the test of, what's the cause of 16 death? Was it, was asbestos-related illness a 17 substantial contributing factor? Was it, the 18 asbestos-related illness was a major -- which test 19 did you use? 20 A Same way you described for Selikoff, took the 21 death certificate regardless of what the death 22 certificate said, reviewed the chart, and found out 23 whether or not that was -- if it said asbestosis, was 24 that legitimate, really was asbestosis and 25 respiratory failure or was it a pneumonia but</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 308</p> <p>1 information. 2 Q That's information? 3 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.) 4 Q But if I want to know with respect to anybody 5 who is on Exhibit-15, that is, for whom you're 6 relying for your idea of progression to death, is 7 there any way that I can determine how you decided 8 what the cause of death was for any of those people? 9 A Probably not because it -- after I've gone 10 through all the things I need to go through, then I 11 fill out on my computer whether it was related to 12 asbestos or whether it was not related to the 13 contributing cause. 14 Q So there's no place that even today -- 15 A There's no written record that will help in 16 that. 17 Q Now, my last question and I am done -- just 18 in time -- relates to going from your group of 79 19 people. 20 You've told us that the 79 people who are 21 listed in Exhibit-15 are the source of information 22 regarding how people with severe diffuse pleural 23 thickening present differently you think from people 24 with the same disease outside of Libby, and we've 25 gone through that now in all the different areas of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 307</p> <p>1 asbestosis was the underlying cause. Was it cor 2 pulmonale, but asbestosis was a cause of cor 3 pulmonale. 4 Q So -- 5 A We were looking for direct cause. 6 Q You were looking for direct cause, that is, 7 the same way a death certificate should be filled 8 out? 9 A Yeah, the way it should have been filled out 10 in the first place, yes. 11 Q Okay. And that's how you included people in 12 your -- 13 A Yes. 14 Q -- group of 79; is that right? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Now, is there anything -- any place that we 17 can go to see how you made that judgment for any of 18 the people who are on your list of 79, that is, 19 Exhibit-15? Is there any place where we can go to 20 find out how you made the judgment about the cause of 21 death? 22 A No, except to go to the chart and you've got 23 other places. You know, I talked to doctors about it 24 and talked to the family physician as to what 25 happened, all kinds of things like that to get the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 309</p> <p>1 difference, thickness of pleura tissue, occupational 2 history or exposure history, blunting, and 3 progression, right? 4 A Right. 5 Q Okay. Now, you offered the view that you 6 could use the information that you have about the 79 7 people from the CARD mortality study and extrapolate 8 to the 950 or, thereabouts, people who have made 9 claims in this case, right? 10 A Correct. 11 Q Okay. And I take it then that you're not 12 going to be relying upon the remaining 850 people for 13 any of your opinions in this case; is that right? 14 A No, there's no way I would be able to in -- 15 MR. LEWIS: No, I think that was 16 confusing. I don't mean to interfere. 17 MR. BERNICK: I'll -- 18 MR. LEWIS: You're talking about -- are 19 you talking about opinions relating to the 20 progression? 21 MR. BERNICK: I'll be very clear. 22 MR. LEWIS: Okay. Because it's -- 23 MR. BERNICK: I'll be very clear. 24 MR. LEWIS: All right. 25 Q (By Mr. Bernick) We know that there's a</p>

78 (Pages 306 to 309)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 310</p> <p>1 motion that's been -- are you familiar there's a</p> <p>2 motion that's been filed in this case?</p> <p>3 A Only one, I understand.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. A motion that's been filed in this</p> <p>5 case to strike testimony that's based on the 1,800</p> <p>6 because we don't have the 850 files. Are you</p> <p>7 familiar with that?</p> <p>8 A Yeah, I'm familiar with it.</p> <p>9 Q I'm sorry?</p> <p>10 A Yes, I am.</p> <p>11 Q And who told you about that?</p> <p>12 A The lawyers.</p> <p>13 Q And what did they tell you about it?</p> <p>14 A That I might not have to go back east.</p> <p>15 Q That's pretty --</p> <p>16 A They were helping me plan my summer.</p> <p>17 Q And you understand, therefore, the problem</p> <p>18 that's been identified or has been alleged in the</p> <p>19 motion is that the people in this case don't have the</p> <p>20 records for the 850 people. Do you understand that?</p> <p>21 A That's what I've heard, yeah.</p> <p>22 Q And so, basically, is it correct that what</p> <p>23 you're saying now is that you believe you can offer</p> <p>24 the opinions that you have to offer in this case</p> <p>25 without having to rely upon the full 1,800, rather</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 312</p> <p>1 pleural disease, et cetera, et cetera.</p> <p>2 MR. LEWIS: Exhibit-15 and -16, is that</p> <p>3 what you're --</p> <p>4 MR. BERNICK: No.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: No, no.</p> <p>6 MR. BERNICK: It was the diagram.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: It was the one that Joel</p> <p>8 did that --</p> <p>9 Q (By Mr. Bernick) Well, let me just be clear.</p> <p>10 A Okay.</p> <p>11 Q If I go to your expert report, I cannot</p> <p>12 find -- let me begin even more basically.</p> <p>13 The 950 people, you've not performed a study</p> <p>14 on the entirety of the 950 people, correct?</p> <p>15 A That's correct.</p> <p>16 Q You've not published a paper on the 950</p> <p>17 people, correct?</p> <p>18 A That's correct.</p> <p>19 Q You've not issued an expert report on -- that</p> <p>20 presents the data of all the 950 people, correct?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q I'm sorry. Is that correct?</p> <p>23 A That's correct.</p> <p>24 Q Now, you have said though that you believe</p> <p>25 you can extrapolate from the experience with the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 311</p> <p>1 you can express your views simply confined to the 950</p> <p>2 people?</p> <p>3 A Yeah, I think so for a number of reasons.</p> <p>4 Q Oh, I didn't ask you reasons.</p> <p>5 A Oh, you don't want me to answer that?</p> <p>6 Q That's what you're doing and that's --</p> <p>7 A That's basically what I'm doing, yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. And that's basically, fair enough, a</p> <p>9 response to this issue that's been raised?</p> <p>10 A I guess, you know.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Now, in order to get opinions about</p> <p>12 the 950, you don't have analyses of all the 950</p> <p>13 people, correct?</p> <p>14 A Not entirely. I do have some analyses</p> <p>15 that -- I have one in particular that's of help.</p> <p>16 Q Well, has it been made available to us?</p> <p>17 A Yeah, it's on the sheet somewhere. I don't</p> <p>18 know where it is, but somewhere it is -- and I can</p> <p>19 relate it to you right now if you want to, how we --</p> <p>20 how I arrived basically at some notions concerning</p> <p>21 that 930 to 950, whatever it is.</p> <p>22 Q Hang on for a second.</p> <p>23 If I have it -- and I don't want something --</p> <p>24 A It's probably on that sheet that you had that</p> <p>25 had all the numbers on it of how many people had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 313</p> <p>1 subgroup of the 950 to the 950, right?</p> <p>2 A That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Now, have you presented an expert</p> <p>4 report on that subject?</p> <p>5 A I think it's somewhere in there, but I'm not</p> <p>6 sure where.</p> <p>7 Q Not somebody -- have you actually presented a</p> <p>8 formal extrapolation from a subgroup of the 950 to</p> <p>9 the 950? I haven't seen it anywhere, but if it</p> <p>10 exists in your report, I'd like to know about it.</p> <p>11 A I thought there is some -- there's reference</p> <p>12 to it in there somewhere, but I don't know where it</p> <p>13 is exactly. I can find it if you want me to or try</p> <p>14 to.</p> <p>15 Q What is -- just tell me, what's the subgroup</p> <p>16 that you're extrapolating from?</p> <p>17 A Okay. The -- there's two parts to this.</p> <p>18 First off is that all 950 of those that have</p> <p>19 lawsuits, all sort of -- all filed them before the</p> <p>20 bankruptcy or shortly -- or around the time of the</p> <p>21 bankruptcy or the vast majority of them did. They</p> <p>22 were all filed somewhere early in this century.</p> <p>23 Q Let's just stop there.</p> <p>24 Where is that data set out? I'm not aware of</p> <p>25 the 950 broken down into people who filed before and</p>

79 (Pages 310 to 313)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 314</p> <p>1 after the bankruptcy.</p> <p>2 A Well, no. Well, almost all of them filed</p> <p>3 beforehand and I do know that to be a fact.</p> <p>4 Q And I've not seen that. Do we have the</p> <p>5 analysis?</p> <p>6 A No, you don't have an analysis of that.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Next step.</p> <p>8 A The second point is that the breakdown on the</p> <p>9 mortality study was 33 percent for miners. The</p> <p>10 remainder -- it was basically almost a third, a</p> <p>11 third, a third.</p> <p>12 Q You say the mortality study --</p> <p>13 A Yeah.</p> <p>14 Q When you say the mortality study --</p> <p>15 A You extrapolate that --</p> <p>16 Q Hang on.</p> <p>17 A You --</p> <p>18 Q No, no, no. I just want to get it piece by</p> <p>19 piece.</p> <p>20 The breakdown that you say of the mortality</p> <p>21 study, who in the mortality study, the 79?</p> <p>22 A The 79.</p> <p>23 Q The 79?</p> <p>24 A The 79.</p> <p>25 Q So if we go to the 79 people, there's a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 316</p> <p>1 want to offer an opinion, and you believe that they</p> <p>2 fall into -- they show a similar breakdown,</p> <p>3 community, worker, family, but we don't have that</p> <p>4 breakdown here today, fair?</p> <p>5 A That's fair.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Go ahead.</p> <p>7 A And based upon that, the probability that the</p> <p>8 statistics in the mortality study will follow through</p> <p>9 on the 950 --</p> <p>10 Q Okay.</p> <p>11 A -- of what we know about the disease and then</p> <p>12 we'll see a similar -- similar death rate,</p> <p>13 ultimately.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. And that's your extrapolation?</p> <p>15 A That's the extrapolation.</p> <p>16 Q Now, is that extrapolation set out in writing</p> <p>17 anywhere that we can look at?</p> <p>18 A I think it is, but I don't know where it is,</p> <p>19 whether it's in my report or whether it's in the</p> <p>20 data. I think it's in the data that was submitted to</p> <p>21 you.</p> <p>22 Q Is there any report that explains for us the</p> <p>23 scientific basis for believing that that</p> <p>24 extrapolation is sound?</p> <p>25 A I doubt there's any specific report, no.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 315</p> <p>1 breakdown between who was a worker and who was a</p> <p>2 family member and who was community?</p> <p>3 A Right.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And that's indicated in Exhibit-15,</p> <p>5 right?</p> <p>6 A That's Exhibit- -- yeah, somewhere in there.</p> <p>7 Q Okay.</p> <p>8 A And then if you look at the 950 claimants,</p> <p>9 the breakdown is almost identical. I mean, it's</p> <p>10 within a couple of percentage points.</p> <p>11 Q Where do we see -- where is that done?</p> <p>12 A Oh, the lawyers have done it.</p> <p>13 Q Do I have --</p> <p>14 A I don't know.</p> <p>15 Q Do I have present in some fashion to us here</p> <p>16 in the case the breakout of the 950 by community</p> <p>17 exposure, family exposures, and worker exposure?</p> <p>18 A I think you do, but I don't know where it is.</p> <p>19 I mean, they would have given it to you.</p> <p>20 Q But you don't have it here today?</p> <p>21 A I do not have it here today.</p> <p>22 Q So you have the 79 people that we have broken</p> <p>23 out by community, family, worker?</p> <p>24 A Mm-hm. (Answers affirmatively.)</p> <p>25 Q You have the 950 with respect to whom you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 317</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Now, I want to then, finally, focus on</p> <p>2 epidemiology. Okay?</p> <p>3 Is it correct there's no epidemiological</p> <p>4 analysis that's been done on the CARD patient</p> <p>5 population? Is that true?</p> <p>6 A Well, yes, there has been because the ATSDR</p> <p>7 and NASA and all that have followed through and</p> <p>8 gotten their exposure histories and haven't published</p> <p>9 it yet.</p> <p>10 Q Well, I'm talking about -- I'm talking about</p> <p>11 something I can get ahold of, something that's</p> <p>12 available to us.</p> <p>13 Is there any available epidemiology on the</p> <p>14 people at the CARD clinic?</p> <p>15 A You know, there's some stuff that just came</p> <p>16 out recently. There are several things actually you</p> <p>17 might want to -- one is -- there was a pilot study</p> <p>18 that was done in 2000.</p> <p>19 Q Pilot study? Is that an epidemiologic study?</p> <p>20 That's a pilot study.</p> <p>21 A Oh, that probably does not qualify, you're</p> <p>22 right.</p> <p>23 Q As of the criminal trial which took place a</p> <p>24 few weeks ago --</p> <p>25 A I think there's some stuff that's come out</p>

80 (Pages 314 to 317)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 318</p> <p>1 recently, but I -- I honestly don't know what's 2 available. 3 Q Today, can you point to any epidemiological 4 study that's been done on the CARD patient 5 population? 6 A No, except for the one that I've done on the 7 pulmonary functions which is (inaudible) 8 epidemiologic study. I guess in a sense the Sullivan 9 study was an epidemiologic study. 10 Q That's on ATSDR? 11 A And Peipins was certainly an epidemiologic 12 study. Those are the three that I'm most familiar 13 with. 14 Q Well, the Peipins study was on the ATSDR 15 population, right? 16 A Yeah. 17 Q And we've already -- we already know that, at 18 least Judge Malloy* didn't feel it was an 19 epidemiological study, correct? 20 A He -- he said it wasn't. 21 Q Yeah, that's his -- 22 A Well, he's wrong. 23 Q Well, he may be right or wrong, but with 24 respect to the CARD patient population, you rely upon 25 the CARD patient population for your opinions in this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 320</p> <p>1 Q Okay. 2 A -- except for what you have here. 3 Q Well, but there is no epidemiology that you 4 presented here on the CARD Clinic, correct? 5 A Well, the mortality study is an epidemiologic 6 study, sure. 7 Q The CARD study? 8 A No, the mortality study. 9 Q The mortality study is an epidemiologic 10 study? 11 A Sure. Sure, it is. 12 Q Just what you have in your little expert 13 reports is an epidemiological study? 14 A No, this whole thing here becomes an 15 epidemiologic study. 16 Q Oh, I'm sorry. 17 So you've now said that Exhibit-15, the list 18 of 79 people, is an epidemiological study? 19 A Yeah, it's a descriptive epidemiologic study. 20 Q It's -- 21 A It describes -- it describes in a patient 22 population certain parameters. That becomes 23 epidemiology. 24 Q Oh, I see. Let's talk about a controlled 25 epidemiologic study.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 319</p> <p>1 case, correct? 2 A That's true. 3 Q And today -- 4 A Well -- 5 Q Well, we went through -- 6 A Let me backtrack a little bit on that one 7 before I say yes because a lot of the data that I 8 rely on is -- they are patients at CARD now, but a 9 lot of it goes back way beyond when I was actually in 10 the CARD. Okay? 11 Q I know. That's your personal knowledge and 12 that's your experience, but in terms of scientific 13 data that you're relying upon, you're relying upon 14 scientific data from the CARD Clinic, correct? 15 A Yeah, and the stuff that you've seen here. 16 Q Right. That's all -- all the stuff I've been 17 seeing here, when it comes to Libby, is data from the 18 CARD Clinic, correct? 19 A Well, there's no place else to get it 20 actually on these people except at the CARD Clinic. 21 Q And today, is it true, that you can't point 22 to any epidemiological work study that's been done 23 and available to us on the people from the CARD 24 Clinic, correct? 25 A That's true --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 321</p> <p>1 There's no controlled epidemiological study 2 that's been done on the CARD patient population, 3 correct? 4 A No, and there probably never will be. 5 Q There's no controlled epidemiological study 6 that you can cite to support your opinion that the 7 presentation of severe diffuse pleural thickening at 8 Libby is different from the presentation of severe 9 diffuse pleural thickening outside of Libby, correct? 10 A No, we've already discussed that. 11 Q I said -- I'm asking about controlled 12 epidemiological studies. There's no study -- 13 A No, there aren't any. 14 Q Okay. And the same thing would be true 15 regarding your opinions of progression, correct? 16 There's no epidemiological study that you can point 17 to, controlled, that supports those opinions, 18 correct? 19 A That's true. 20 MR. BERNICK: Okay. And I have no 21 further questions at this time. Sorry to take so 22 much of your time today, Dr. Whitehouse, although we 23 always enjoy the debate, right? 24 THE WITNESS: I'm not so sure about 25 that necessarily.</p>

81 (Pages 318 to 321)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 322</p> <p>1 MR. BERNICK: Oh, come on. 2 Anybody on the phone have any questions? 3 MR. SVIRSKY: Yeah. This is Gary 4 Svirskey from O'Melveny & Myers. I have a few 5 questions for Dr. Whitehouse. 6 MR. BERNICK: How long is it going to 7 take, roughly? 8 MR. SVIRSKY: I don't know. It depends 9 on how much Dr. Whitehouse has to say. Maybe twenty 10 minutes. Maybe thirty minutes. 11 MR. LEWIS: Can we take a break then? 12 MR. SVIRSKY: I'm happy to defer to 13 anybody else in the room who wants -- 14 MR. BERNICK: No, no, we're all dying 15 to hear your questions. 16 MR. SVIRSKY: Oh, okay. 17 MR. BERNICK: We're not sure why -- why 18 Arrowood would have any particular interest in this 19 case, but that's also a subject of curiosity, so go 20 ahead. 21 Oh, do you want to take a break? 22 MR. LEWIS: Just a very short -- 23 MR. BERNICK: We'll take a short break. 24 We'll let you know when we come back. 25 MR. SVIRSKY: All right. Let me know</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 324</p> <p>1 various asbestos claimants? 2 A Yes, certainly. 3 Q How many did you consider in total? 4 A Are you talking about Libby or -- and what 5 first deposition? In March or two years ago? 6 Q I'm referring to the deposition in March. 7 A I think -- 8 Q How many did you consider in total, sir? 9 A Well, basically, I'm not sure I can answer 10 that question. Basically, I see most of the patients 11 at the CARD Clinic at one time or another and I ask 12 most of them about their exposure histories. 13 Q Could you give an approximate number of the 14 number of individual exposure histories you 15 considered in rendering your opinion in this case? 16 A That's a hard question to answer because I 17 don't keep track of it, but I'm sure well over a 18 thousand. 19 Q Is it over two thousand, sir? 20 A Well, not in Libby, no. It's less than that. 21 Q And how many individuals from Libby did you 22 consider? 23 A Well, that thousand that I told you about is 24 probably the ones that I've taken exposure histories 25 from.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 323</p> <p>1 when you're ready. 2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're going off the 3 record. The time now is 4:12 p.m. 4 (Recess.) 5 (Mr. Bernick exits.) 6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're back on the 7 record. The time is now 4:24 p.m. 8 EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. SVIRSKY: 10 Q Dr. Whitehouse, can you hear me? 11 A I can. 12 Q Okay. Good afternoon. My name is Gary 13 Svirskey. I'm an attorney at O'Melveny & Myers. I 14 represent Arrowood Indemnity Company formerly known 15 as Royal Indemnity Company. 16 I've got just a few questions for you, and 17 since we're doing this by phone, please let me know 18 if you can't hear me or something comes across 19 garbled and I'll try and restate. 20 A Okay. 21 Q Fair? 22 A Understood. 23 Q Okay. Now, Dr. Whitehouse, am I correct that 24 you stated in your first deposition that you have 25 considered hundreds of exposure histories from</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 325</p> <p>1 Q I see. 2 And are there others outside of Libby that 3 you considered in rendering your opinion in this 4 case? 5 A Well, yeah, all the patients that I saw for 6 Hanford and other asbestos places in the past, mostly 7 prior to 2002, and there's probably 500 of those. 8 Q Okay. And where did you get those patients' 9 information, the ones outside Libby? 10 A Oh, I took it myself. 11 Q Now, there's a database that's been referred 12 to as the 550 database. Are you familiar with that? 13 A I am. 14 Q Other than the lost 550 database, how many of 15 the patient histories have you considered both inside 16 Libby or within Libby and outside Libby are still in 17 your possession? 18 A Oh, the histories? All of them. They're all 19 at the CARD Clinic. Is that what -- is that what 20 you're referring to in those patients? 21 Q Well, I'm talking -- the CARD Clinic is -- 22 does not contain the Libby individuals, does it? 23 A Yes, it does. 24 Q It does. 25 So you just told me you considered about a</p>

82 (Pages 322 to 325)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 326</p> <p>1 thousand individuals within Libby; is that correct?</p> <p>2 A Or probably more, but I don't know -- you</p> <p>3 know, I've seen most of the patients in Libby at one</p> <p>4 time or another, but some of them I didn't need to</p> <p>5 take an exposure history from them. It was already</p> <p>6 well done. I didn't need to do it.</p> <p>7 Q Of those individuals within Libby whose</p> <p>8 exposure history you considered, how many are still</p> <p>9 in your possession?</p> <p>10 A They're in the possession of the CARD Clinic,</p> <p>11 every one of them. Every patient that I saw in my</p> <p>12 private practice and at the CARD Clinic's chart</p> <p>13 remains at Libby unless for some reason it got lost</p> <p>14 when I quit my practice in 2004.</p> <p>15 Q And have you produced those in this action,</p> <p>16 sir?</p> <p>17 A As far as I know, everything has been</p> <p>18 produced, yes.</p> <p>19 Q And what about the patient histories for</p> <p>20 individuals outside Libby? How many -- you said you</p> <p>21 considered about 500 or so of those; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A I have none of those charts. Those charts</p> <p>23 have undoubtedly been destroyed by now because</p> <p>24 there's a seven-year statute of limitations and they</p> <p>25 were in the possession of another pulmonary group</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 328</p> <p>1 A No, I don't have that now, although the</p> <p>2 database in Libby does have it.</p> <p>3 Q I'm sorry. Can you say that again, please?</p> <p>4 A The Libby database does have it and it now is</p> <p>5 nearly at a point where it can function.</p> <p>6 Q But you don't know offhand what the</p> <p>7 percentage is?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q Did you ever consider how many of the</p> <p>10 individuals that you -- whose histories you reviewed</p> <p>11 worked at blue collar jobs other than Grace?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And what percentage of individuals would that</p> <p>14 be?</p> <p>15 A I don't know the exact percentage, but I know</p> <p>16 there were people that worked in the lumber mill</p> <p>17 which was blue collar jobs and had some exposure to</p> <p>18 asbestos as well.</p> <p>19 Q What was -- not as an exact number, but</p> <p>20 what's your best sense of that number?</p> <p>21 A Ah, geez. You know, I really don't know.</p> <p>22 Probably less than ten percent, but I don't know the</p> <p>23 number. The lawyers have that number.</p> <p>24 Q Did you consider whether any of the</p> <p>25 individuals from Grace had worked at blue collar jobs</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 327</p> <p>1 that act as the -- sort of the safe keeper and</p> <p>2 distributor of them after I quit practice, so those</p> <p>3 probably do not exist any more because they just</p> <p>4 finished, I think, in the last couple of years</p> <p>5 cleaning out a lot of old charts.</p> <p>6 Q Now, Dr. Whitehouse, how many of the</p> <p>7 individuals whose histories you reviewed claim that</p> <p>8 they were exposed to asbestos from sources other than</p> <p>9 Grace?</p> <p>10 A You mean the ones in Libby?</p> <p>11 Q All the individuals you reviewed.</p> <p>12 A Well, the ones that I reviewed, you know, in</p> <p>13 my office previously, none of them had Grace</p> <p>14 exposures, those 500. The ones that I saw in Libby</p> <p>15 all had exposure in some form or another to Libby</p> <p>16 asbestos. They also -- some of them had exposure to</p> <p>17 other forms of asbestos in their employment.</p> <p>18 Q How many of the individuals who had --</p> <p>19 withdrawn.</p> <p>20 What percentage of the individuals had</p> <p>21 exposure to sources other than Grace?</p> <p>22 A I have no idea.</p> <p>23 Q So is it correct that you did not attempt to</p> <p>24 quantify what share of the individuals in Libby had</p> <p>25 exposure to asbestos from sources other than Grace?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 329</p> <p>1 other than Grace?</p> <p>2 A Yes. That's what --</p> <p>3 Q Is that the ten percent answer you gave me or</p> <p>4 is that a different number?</p> <p>5 A No, that's that ten percent that I -- that's</p> <p>6 not very exact. There were people that worked</p> <p>7 outside of Libby around asbestos.</p> <p>8 Q And do you know what percentage of</p> <p>9 individuals that was?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Did you ever consider whether any individuals</p> <p>12 whose history you reviewed worked in ship building?</p> <p>13 A Yeah, there were some that did work in ship</p> <p>14 building and there were some in Libby that had worked</p> <p>15 in ship building. Some of them were in the Navy</p> <p>16 also.</p> <p>17 Q How many would that be?</p> <p>18 A I have no idea. You're asking me numbers</p> <p>19 that I haven't kept track of. Not a lot. Probably</p> <p>20 twenty, thirty at the most.</p> <p>21 Q Did you consider how many of the individuals</p> <p>22 whose histories you reviewed had done work with brake</p> <p>23 linings?</p> <p>24 A That question was asked and it was a very</p> <p>25 small insignificant number.</p>

83 (Pages 326 to 329)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 330</p> <p>1 (Ms. Rickards returns from 2 recess.) 3 Q (By Mr. Svirsky) Did you do -- did you 4 consider how many individuals had been exposed to 5 brake linings in their homes fixing their own cars? 6 A No, I never asked that question. 7 Q Did you consider how many individuals were 8 exposed to gaskets, either professionally or in doing 9 personal repairs? 10 A Not specifically. 11 Q Is that a no or is there a portion that's 12 not -- specifically that's a yes? 13 A I guess that's a no. 14 Q Did you ever consider how many of the 15 individuals whose histories you reviewed were exposed 16 to any form of insulated piping, either 17 professionally in their work or in doing repairs at 18 home or elsewhere? 19 A No, there's a fair number that were, but, 20 again, I don't have a number on that. 21 Q Did you consider how many individuals worked 22 with insulated piping not professionally, at home 23 doing repairs? 24 A I don't think I asked that. 25 Q Did you consider how many people did welding</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 332</p> <p>1 Q And was there any time frame you used for 2 temporary residents? 3 A No, it was just recorded as to how long they 4 lived there or whether they vacationed there or what 5 the case may be. 6 Q Did you break out the effects for miners 7 versus non-miners? 8 A Oh, yes. 9 Q Did you break out for smokers versus 10 non-smokers? 11 A Yeah, we have that in the database too. 12 Q And for smokers, you broke it out by how much 13 they smoked? 14 A Yes. 15 Q And do you know how many of the individuals 16 in Libby were smokers? 17 A No. It's got the highest incidence of 18 smoking quitting (sic) in the world, I think, since 19 2000. Almost every smoker quit. 20 Q Do you know how many were smokers before 21 2000? 22 A No, but it probably was like the general 23 population of a blue collar area, and I think a large 24 number of the miners smoked, most of them probably. 25 Q What is the ratio for the general population?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 331</p> <p>1 professionally or otherwise? 2 A Yeah, we do have that in the database, yes. 3 Q Did you specifically consider how many 4 individuals worked with welding rods in a 5 non-professional setting? 6 A No, I don't have numbers of any of those 7 things that you're asking me. 8 Q Well, I wasn't asking for a number, sir. I 9 was asking whether you considered that. 10 A I don't remember whether we considered that 11 or not. I think we just talked about welding. 12 Q Now, did you consider the effects of asbestos 13 exposure as they're differentiated between men and 14 women? 15 A No, we have not yet. 16 Q Did you ever breakdown -- 17 MR. LEWIS: We couldn't hear that 18 question. There was an interruption on the line or 19 something. I'm sorry, Counsel. 20 Q (By Mr. Svirsky) Did you -- for the 21 individuals whose histories you considered, 22 Dr. Whitehouse, did you ever break it down into 23 permanent residents of Libby versus temporary 24 residents? 25 A Yeah, that's all been broken down.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 333</p> <p>1 A What do you mean? Of miners? 2 Q Yeah. You just said it's probably like the 3 general population of blue collar workers. 4 What is the ratio of the general population 5 for blue collar workers who were smokers before 2000? 6 A I don't know. 7 Q Do you know approximately? 8 A No. 9 Q You have no idea? 10 A No, I don't live in Libby to begin with, and, 11 you know, I know some areas where there was blue 12 collar workers, but I don't know what the total is, 13 you know. It's a blue collar company town pretty 14 much. 15 Q Do you have -- do you have any sense of what 16 the general population of blue collar workers in the 17 United States was that smoked before 2000? 18 A No. 19 Q Do you know what it was in Washington state? 20 A No. 21 Q Did you consider how many of the individuals 22 from Libby whose histories you considered have 23 alleged asbestos-related bodily injury claims against 24 other defendants other than Grace? 25 A No, I do not. I only actually know of one,</p>

84 (Pages 330 to 333)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 334</p> <p>1 but there may be more.</p> <p>2 Q I'm sorry. You said you know of one?</p> <p>3 A That's the only -- I only know of one.</p> <p>4 Q How did you learn about that one?</p> <p>5 A It was a patient of mine.</p> <p>6 Q So other than -- withdrawn.</p> <p>7 So you just learned about it randomly from</p> <p>8 speaking to your patient?</p> <p>9 A It was a patient I saw and he told me about</p> <p>10 it a long time ago, probably close to ten years ago,</p> <p>11 and I sent a bunch of stuff off to a lawyer</p> <p>12 somewhere, and I can't even remember where and that's</p> <p>13 the last I heard of it.</p> <p>14 Q So other than randomly finding out that</p> <p>15 information from one of your patients, you did not</p> <p>16 specifically look for that information to consider;</p> <p>17 is that right?</p> <p>18 A No, I think we did. I think we generally</p> <p>19 asked people about legal actions and things and there</p> <p>20 aren't very many people out there that do except for</p> <p>21 against Grace.</p> <p>22 Q I'm sorry. When you said legal actions, what</p> <p>23 were you referring to, sir?</p> <p>24 A I was referring to people at the CARD Clinic</p> <p>25 who had legal actions against other -- other</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 336</p> <p>1 opinion?</p> <p>2 A That's where it all came from. It came from</p> <p>3 the Libby -- or W.R. Grace's vermiculite mine.</p> <p>4 That's where all the asbestos in town came from.</p> <p>5 Q Other than the asbestos in the mine, did you</p> <p>6 account for other ambient asbestos in Libby -- in the</p> <p>7 area of Libby, Montana?</p> <p>8 A Not that we're aware of. I don't think there</p> <p>9 is any other.</p> <p>10 Q Did you conduct any tests to determine</p> <p>11 whether there was any other asbestos or review any --</p> <p>12 anybody else's tests in that regard?</p> <p>13 A No, not really.</p> <p>14 Q Are there activities that disturb asbestos</p> <p>15 that's naturally occurring to release it into the</p> <p>16 air?</p> <p>17 A You mean in Libby?</p> <p>18 Q Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. LEWIS: Object as to the form of</p> <p>20 the question.</p> <p>21 MR. SVIRSKY: I'll ask it again or</p> <p>22 differently.</p> <p>23 Q (By Mr. Svirskey) Are there activities in</p> <p>24 general anywhere, Libby or elsewhere on the planet,</p> <p>25 that would disturb asbestos naturally occurring in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 335</p> <p>1 companies other than W.R. Grace.</p> <p>2 Q And you factored that into your analysis,</p> <p>3 sir?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q No.</p> <p>6 How did you quantify the impact of asbestos</p> <p>7 from sources other than Grace on the population in</p> <p>8 Libby that you reviewed for your report?</p> <p>9 A In many respects, we actually haven't done so</p> <p>10 because it's not possible to do it. Most of the</p> <p>11 exposure that people had, they weren't even very</p> <p>12 familiar with how much exposure they had, and so the</p> <p>13 best we can estimate is whether it was a big exposure</p> <p>14 or a small exposure from what they tell us, and aside</p> <p>15 from that, it's not possible to factor it into</p> <p>16 anything.</p> <p>17 Q Now, Dr. Whitehouse, you're aware that</p> <p>18 asbestos is naturally present in soil and rock and</p> <p>19 elsewhere in the environment, are you not?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And it's a fact that asbestos is naturally</p> <p>22 present in the area of Libby, Montana, is it not?</p> <p>23 A No doubt.</p> <p>24 Q Did you account for that presence of natural</p> <p>25 asbestos in Libby, Montana, in rendering your</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 337</p> <p>1 the environment to release asbestos particles in the</p> <p>2 air?</p> <p>3 A Sure, there are. There's lots of them.</p> <p>4 Q What are some of those activities,</p> <p>5 Dr. Whitehouse?</p> <p>6 A Oh, there's one around Sacramento,</p> <p>7 California. It's a district where they're building a</p> <p>8 lot of buildings. There's apparently a bunch of</p> <p>9 homes in southern California that have it used as</p> <p>10 fill in their homes, and there's other places, rock</p> <p>11 quarries in New Hampshire have asbestos. There's</p> <p>12 probably some asbestos in South Carolina in Grace's</p> <p>13 vermiculite mine. It's all over.</p> <p>14 Q And what activities disturb -- cause the</p> <p>15 release of that asbestos to increase in the air?</p> <p>16 A Well, the obvious is mining and digging it</p> <p>17 up, but aside from that, I don't know. I'm not an</p> <p>18 expert in that and I don't deal with that.</p> <p>19 Q So is it fair to say that you did not account</p> <p>20 for any factors that might have released naturally</p> <p>21 occurring asbestos in the area of Libby into the air</p> <p>22 other than through mining activities?</p> <p>23 A Oh, no. People went up to the mine and got</p> <p>24 vermiculite and they hauled it down in their pickups</p> <p>25 and put it in their backyard and their attics and</p>

85 (Pages 334 to 337)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 338</p> <p>1 their gardens and paved the school tracks, paved 2 roads. They did all kinds of things with it, and 3 that was outside of the mining itself. 4 Q Did you consider the release of asbestos 5 other than what you just described as asbestos that 6 was mined and then brought to the town and used? 7 A Well, you know, we knew that the lumber mill 8 had some chrysotile in pipe insulation. That's the 9 only other source of asbestos that we know of. 10 Q Did you account for that asbestos in your 11 analysis? 12 A We haven't done analyses that would -- I'm 13 not sure what you're talking about. Account for it 14 in an analyses, tell me what you mean. 15 Q How did you factor in the asbestos in the 16 lumber mills in to rendering your report? 17 A We don't. I haven't. 18 Q And how did you account for naturally 19 occurring asbestos elsewhere in the area of Libby, 20 Montana, other than what was mined and otherwise used 21 in the town in rendering your report in this case, 22 Dr. Whitehouse? 23 A We haven't. There isn't any. 24 Q I'm sorry. You said there isn't any. What 25 do you mean there isn't any?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 340</p> <p>1 A Well, the EPA has done extensive tests, and 2 if you need to look at that in detail, you can ask 3 the EPA for the data which is public data. 4 Q Dr. Whitehouse, my question was whether you 5 reviewed any materials that measured naturally 6 occurring asbestos in the area of Libby, Montana. 7 A No, I have not. 8 Q Now, who determined what documents or other 9 materials you reviewed to prepare your expert report 10 in this case? 11 A Oh, this is a compilation of articles and 12 research and medical stuff that goes back ten years. 13 Large amounts of stuff that I've collected, 14 literature, particularly large volumes of literature. 15 Q My question was: Dr. Whitehouse, who 16 determined what you reviewed? 17 A I determine what I review. 18 Q So that was solely in your own discretion; is 19 that right? 20 A Well, I get things through the clinic 21 sometimes. You know, a fellow that I work with in 22 the clinic gets articles occasionally, and he has 23 PubMed, and occasionally we look up things there, so 24 there's just a variety, but that's where it comes 25 from.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 339</p> <p>1 A I don't think there's any other naturally 2 occurring asbestos around except what's associated 3 with the mine. 4 Q Well, perhaps I didn't hear you correctly 5 over the phone. I thought you said you never 6 conducted any tests to determine how much naturally 7 occurring asbestos there was in Libby, Montana, other 8 than in the mine. 9 A I don't -- I don't know that you understand. 10 I'm a practicing chest physician, not an analytic 11 chemist or anything like that. I don't do that kind 12 of testing. 13 Q Well, that's fine, sir. I just want to -- I 14 just want to have a record of what you did and didn't 15 do. 16 And just so we have it clear, you did not 17 conduct any test to determine what naturally 18 occurring asbestos there was in Libby, Montana, other 19 than what was in the mine, right? 20 A That's correct. 21 Q And you didn't review any materials that 22 anybody else had prepared to determine how much 23 naturally occurring asbestos there was in the area of 24 Libby, Montana, other than what was the mine, 25 correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 341</p> <p>1 Q Did the attorneys who retained you to render 2 a report here direct you to any materials to review 3 in connection with your report? 4 A Yeah, they've given me materials also. 5 Q What materials did they give you? 6 A Mostly it's published articles that they run 7 across for some reason or another. 8 Q Anything else? 9 A Not really. The stuff that they have used an 10 accountant to put together is all stuff that I 11 developed. 12 Q Now, did you turn over in this case all the 13 documents that you reviewed or relied upon in 14 rendering your report by March 16, 2009? 15 A I believe I did. The lawyers were 16 responsible for some of those reports getting sent 17 too, so I turned over everything I was supposed to. 18 Q To whom did you turn everything over to? 19 A Well, John Heberling who's the attorney at 20 Kalispell that is doing a lot of this work is -- he's 21 the one that has the various documents and that gets 22 turned over, things that I've developed and things 23 that -- I've written also about things in the 24 literature that I've had. It's just -- all of it 25 goes through him to be delivered to W.R. Grace.</p>

86 (Pages 338 to 341)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 342</p> <p>1 Q So just to be clear, by March 16 of 2009,</p> <p>2 it's your testimony that you have produced to</p> <p>3 Mr. Heberling or his associates or partners</p> <p>4 everything that you reviewed or relied upon in</p> <p>5 rendering your report in this case; is that right?</p> <p>6 A Yes, and I have produced everything that</p> <p>7 anybody has asked me to produce.</p> <p>8 Q But you don't know whether Mr. Heberling</p> <p>9 produced by that date to all the parties to this</p> <p>10 litigation; is that right?</p> <p>11 A I have no idea.</p> <p>12 Q Now, in paragraph two of your expert report,</p> <p>13 you mention 1,800 active cases. I assume you have a</p> <p>14 copy of your report somewhere?</p> <p>15 A I do.</p> <p>16 Q Do you see that reference to 1,800 active</p> <p>17 cases?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Have you turned over all the medical records</p> <p>20 in connection with those 1,800 cases?</p> <p>21 A I haven't personally and I have no idea</p> <p>22 whether they've been turned over at this point or</p> <p>23 not. I don't think all 1,800 have.</p> <p>24 Q How many have been turned over?</p> <p>25 A Well, I know all the claimants' records have</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 344</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: That's Exhibit-3 to this</p> <p>2 deposition for the record.</p> <p>3 Q (By Mr. Svirsky) Now, in addition to</p> <p>4 Exhibit-3 to this deposition, have you produced any</p> <p>5 documents after May 27, 2009, for production in this</p> <p>6 litigation?</p> <p>7 A I don't believe so. I'm not sure. I don't</p> <p>8 think so.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Now, other than the -- some of the</p> <p>10 files in connection with the 1,800 active cases in</p> <p>11 paragraph two of your report, are there any other</p> <p>12 documents that you reviewed or relied upon in</p> <p>13 rendering your opinions that have not been produced</p> <p>14 in this litigation?</p> <p>15 A Well, I have a bibliography of about 1,000</p> <p>16 literature articles that I've read, multiple</p> <p>17 textbooks.</p> <p>18 Q Leaving aside the list of materials in your</p> <p>19 bibliography, are there any other materials or</p> <p>20 documents that you relied upon in rendering your</p> <p>21 opinions?</p> <p>22 A I don't think so. I think it's all been</p> <p>23 produced.</p> <p>24 Q Other than what you described about the 1,800</p> <p>25 active cases in paragraph two, right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 343</p> <p>1 been turned over and a significant number of my</p> <p>2 records that are not claimants, but I don't know how</p> <p>3 many actually totally have been turned over.</p> <p>4 Q But not all of the 1,800 have been turned</p> <p>5 over in production; is that right, sir?</p> <p>6 A I don't really know for sure. I understand</p> <p>7 there may not be, but that's not my responsibility.</p> <p>8 Q I'm not blaming or accusing you,</p> <p>9 Dr. Whitehouse. I just want to get the record on</p> <p>10 this.</p> <p>11 A Well, that's the best answer I can give you.</p> <p>12 I'm sorry.</p> <p>13 Q Since May 27, 2009, have you produced to</p> <p>14 Mr. Heberling or any of the lawyers he works with any</p> <p>15 additional medical records or documents for</p> <p>16 production in this case?</p> <p>17 A Well, we brought here what's called a final</p> <p>18 key which is the names of all the Libby claimants</p> <p>19 with a number that corresponds, I think, to a</p> <p>20 numbering of charts that they already have, and also</p> <p>21 in there indicates just their birth date and there's</p> <p>22 initials for people that do not have attorneys or are</p> <p>23 not claimants in this case, and those records have</p> <p>24 been redacted and sent over, I would think too, and</p> <p>25 there's a total of 1,030 in this list.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 345</p> <p>1 A Yeah, and I don't know what the status of all</p> <p>2 that is.</p> <p>3 Q Now, in connection with the so-called 550</p> <p>4 database, was any of the data that was lost there</p> <p>5 kept in any other source?</p> <p>6 A No, the data actually is all -- the feds have</p> <p>7 all the data. They were given it, the Department of</p> <p>8 Justice for the criminal trial. Unfortunately, the</p> <p>9 names were all redacted and so there's -- there's not</p> <p>10 really any clear way to identify it except by date of</p> <p>11 birth and it can probably be identified that way.</p> <p>12 Those are mostly non-claimants, and so there were a</p> <p>13 lot of charts that were given to the government or</p> <p>14 given to Grace a long time ago, four, five years ago</p> <p>15 that were all redacted except that I understand for</p> <p>16 the date of birth, and so it's all retrievable</p> <p>17 because I have a list of the names of the people now,</p> <p>18 but I don't have any charts that go with them, so</p> <p>19 it's possible to recreate that, although it'd take</p> <p>20 some work to do it.</p> <p>21 Q I'm sorry. You said it is possible to</p> <p>22 recreate that -- that data?</p> <p>23 A Well, possibly except that unfortunately,</p> <p>24 you're not going to get the names because of HIPAA</p> <p>25 laws. These were mostly my patients and not CARD</p>

87 (Pages 342 to 345)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 346</p> <p>1 patients. I mean, some of them. Some of them 2 certainly are CARD patients, and I don't know what 3 the breakdown is. 4 Q And what would you look to to recreate that 5 data? What information would you look to? 6 A You'd have to have all the charts there with 7 all the date of births, if they're still intact on 8 the charts, and then I'd have to review them, and I 9 guess we can tell you which ones have lawsuits and 10 which ones don't. 11 You wouldn't be able to get any further 12 information in the ones that don't have lawsuits. 13 The data on -- you know, the data is basically junk 14 because I stopped keeping it. It was kept sort of 15 erratically after I closed my practice, and so it's 16 not very accurate. 17 Everybody's interested in that. I'm not sure 18 why. 19 Q Do you still have the charts and the 20 background data that you described from which you 21 could recreate the 550 database? 22 A I do not. I was provided with a chart of the 23 names which came from the CARD Clinic because they 24 kept a list of who they sent to Grace in 2005 or so, 25 and I don't have -- I have nothing left on my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 348</p> <p>1 it hourly or piecemeal or another way? 2 A Hourly. 3 Q And how many hours -- what was your hourly 4 compensation rate? 5 A Right now it's 350 for depositions and 300 6 for reviewing records, but probably at the beginning 7 of this was like -- you know, this all began about 8 twelve or fourteen years ago, so it was probably 9 considerably less then. 10 Q So how many hours would you say you've spent 11 on this case? 12 A On this case or the bankruptcy or everything 13 else? 14 Q Yeah, the bankruptcy now. Let me rephrase 15 that. 16 How many hours did you spend to prepare the 17 report that was submitted in this case? 18 A You know, really, I don't know because the 19 report has been done piecemeal. It keeps getting 20 changed periodically when new data becomes available, 21 and then parts of the old -- some of the parts of 22 this report go back probably four or five years and 23 other parts are new. 24 MR. LEWIS: Counsel, we've been going 25 for over seven hours and I think that's the cutoff</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 347</p> <p>1 computer with that. I had a computer crash and lost 2 it, and I didn't -- unfortunately, I did not have it 3 backed up. 4 I suspect I didn't back it up because I knew 5 that the CARD had it and that the Department of 6 Justice had it and I didn't worry about it because I 7 wasn't using it, so I didn't -- we didn't track it 8 down at that time. It wasn't worth doing. 9 Q So the CARD Clinic has the background 10 information that one would need to recreate the 550 11 database? 12 A They might be able to. They can't do it 13 without me. 14 Q Have you tried to recreate the 550 database 15 by looking at the CARD Clinic information? 16 A No. 17 Q Now, Dr. Whitehouse, how much have you been 18 paid in connection with your expert opinion and 19 testimony in this matter? 20 A What, today or when? 21 Q In total. 22 A I already told Mr. Bernick -- or was it 23 Mr. Finch, I guess -- that probably over a long 24 period of time, over \$100,000. 25 Q And on what basis were you compensated? Was</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 349</p> <p>1 point. How much more do you have? 2 MR. SVIRSKY: I'm just about done here. 3 MR. LEWIS: Okay. Let's speed it up 4 then, please. 5 Q (By Mr. Svirsky) All right. Did you submit 6 billing statements for your work here to get 7 compensated? 8 MR. LEWIS: Objection. Counsel, you're 9 talking about here. This doctor has testified at a 10 federal criminal trial. He's participated in the 11 workup on that. 12 MR. SVIRSKY: Well, let me just correct 13 that, so it's clear. 14 MR. LEWIS: Yeah. 15 Q (By Mr. Svirsky) Did you submit billing 16 statements in general for any work you did in 17 connection with Libby claimants and bankruptcy or the 18 criminal trial or elsewhere so that you could get 19 paid for your services? 20 A Yeah, I have. Every month, I keep it up to 21 date. 22 Q Have those billing statements been produced 23 in discovery in this case? 24 A No. 25 Q Have you received any compensation from any</p>

88 (Pages 346 to 349)

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 350</p> <p>1 individual claimant?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q Who pays you?</p> <p>4 A Attorneys.</p> <p>5 Q Mr. Heberling?</p> <p>6 A Mr. Heberling, the Department of Justice.</p> <p>7 There will be a bill that goes to the Grace attorneys</p> <p>8 for today.</p> <p>9 Q Are you still -- are you treating any of the</p> <p>10 Libby claimants now?</p> <p>11 A Yeah, I still go up there once a month.</p> <p>12 Q How many Libby claimants are your patients</p> <p>13 now?</p> <p>14 A Well, I really don't know because we're --</p> <p>15 we're -- you know, I see a lot of them once a year,</p> <p>16 and I probably see ten to fifteen once a month when</p> <p>17 I'm up there, so I probably see 150, 200 a year. I</p> <p>18 don't know the exact number though.</p> <p>19 MR. SVIRSKY: Thank you for your -- for</p> <p>20 staying behind to answer my questions,</p> <p>21 Dr. Whitehouse. I don't have anything else.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>23 MS. DeCRISTOFARO: Mr. Lewis, this is</p> <p>24 Elizabeth DeCristofaro. I have just two questions</p> <p>25 quickly.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 352</p> <p>1 been a lot since 2001. It's about four occupational</p> <p>2 medicine cases and no trials and then the criminal</p> <p>3 trial.</p> <p>4 Q Have you prepared any report with respect to</p> <p>5 any of the Libby claimants since 2001?</p> <p>6 A Oh, yeah, it's a huge report.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Let me clarify. I mean on behalf of</p> <p>8 an individual claimant --</p> <p>9 A No.</p> <p>10 Q -- for a specific claim.</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 MS. DeCRISTOFARO: Those are my only</p> <p>13 questions. Thank you very much.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>15 MR. LEWIS: Anyone else?</p> <p>16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the</p> <p>17 record. The time is now 5:01 p.m. This is the end</p> <p>18 of disk number four and, herein, ends the deposition</p> <p>19 for today.</p> <p>20 (Signature reserved.)</p> <p>21 (Deposition concluded</p> <p>22 at 5:01 p.m.)</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 351</p> <p>1 MR. LEWIS: There's no problem with</p> <p>2 that, ma'am.</p> <p>3 EXAMINATION</p> <p>4 BY MS. DeCRISTOFARO:</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Dr. Whitehouse, my name is Elizabeth</p> <p>6 DeCristofaro. I just wanted to know -- following up</p> <p>7 on the questions you were just asked -- have you</p> <p>8 testified on behalf of a Libby claimant since April</p> <p>9 2001?</p> <p>10 A How did I what?</p> <p>11 MR. LONGOSZ: Have you.</p> <p>12 Q (By Ms. DeCristofaro) Have you testified?</p> <p>13 MR. LEWIS: Since April 2001?</p> <p>14 MS. DeCRISTOFARO: Yes.</p> <p>15 A Oh, yes, since before that.</p> <p>16 Q (By Ms. DeCristofaro) Well, no, since that</p> <p>17 time.</p> <p>18 A Oh, yeah, I have.</p> <p>19 Q And in what cases have you testified on</p> <p>20 behalf of a Libby claimant?</p> <p>21 A Well, I testified in several occupational</p> <p>22 medicine cases. They are actually in the expert</p> <p>23 report, a list of what I've testified to, so if you</p> <p>24 have a copy of that, it'll give you the -- give you a</p> <p>25 list of what I've testified to, and there has not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 353</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 S-I-G-N-A-T-U-R-E</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 I declare under penalty of perjury</p> <p>9 under the laws of the State of Washington that I have</p> <p>10 read my within deposition, and the same is true and</p> <p>11 accurate, save and except for changes and/or</p> <p>12 corrections, if any, as indicated by me on the CHANGE</p> <p>13 SHEET flyleaf page hereof. Signed</p> <p>14 in.....WA on the.....day</p> <p>15 of....., 2009.</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 cmz</p> <p>ALAN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.D. June 16, 2009</p>

89 (Pages 350 to 353)

Buell Realtime Reporting
206 287 9066

In re: W.R. Grace & Co., Debtor

Alan C. Whitehouse, M.D.

Page 354

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON) I, CATHY M. ZAK,
) ss CCR# 1922 a duly
 2 County of King) authorized Notary
 Public in and for the
 3 State of Washington
 residing at Bellevue,
 4 do hereby certify:
 5
 6

7 That the foregoing deposition of
 ALAN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.D., was taken before me and
 completed on June 16, 2009, and thereafter was
 8 transcribed under my direction; that the deposition
 is a full, true and complete transcript of the
 9 testimony of said witness, including all questions,
 answers, objections, motions and exceptions;
 10

11 That the witness, before examination,
 was by me duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
 truth, and nothing but the truth, and that the
 12 witness reserved the right of signature;

13 That I am not a relative, employee,
 attorney or counsel of any party to this action or
 14 relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel
 and that I am not financially interested in the said
 15 action or the outcome thereof.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
 set my hand and affixed my official seal on June 22,
 17 2009.
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

23 Cathy M. Zak, CCR
 Notary Public in and for the State
 of Washington, residing at Bellevue.
 24
 25

90 (Page 354)

Buell Realtime Reporting
 206 287 9066